



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration**

DOT HS 807 383

November 1987

Final Report

Program Activities Associated with Safety Belt Use Volume II: Research Report

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers' names appear only because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

1. Report No. DOT HS 807 383		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Program Activities Associated With Safety Belt Use Volume II, Research Report				5. Report Date November 13, 1987	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Jon E. Burkhardt, Jennifer A. Shannon, Hannah Worthington, Mark C. Wozny, and Alan W. Block				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Escosometrics, Incorporated 4715 Cordell Avenue Bethesda, Maryland 20814				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-86-C-07338	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address National Highway Traffic Safety Administration U. S. Department of Transportation 400 7th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report April 1986 - November 1987	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes Dr. Ramon C. "Jesse" Blatt of NHTSA's Office of Driver and Pedestrian Research was the Government Technical Officer on this Contract.					
16. Abstract By the end of 1986, 26 states and the District of Columbia had active safety belt use laws, each supported by a variety of state and community activities. They were not equally successful, as belt-use rates ranged from 23 to 74 percent. To investigate these differences, this study documented the types of activities conducted by the states' implementation programs and identified specific activities at the community level that appeared to be related to higher belt use rates. The major categories of program activities were community support, employer support, public information and education, media efforts, enforcement, and adjudication. Case studies of eight communities, four with belt use above 50 percent and four with belt use below 50 percent, showed that programs in the higher-use communities maximized media market penetration, tailored and targeted messages to specific subpopulations, and showed higher levels of enforcement of safety belt violations. <u>Volume 1: User's Summary</u> , provides an overview of the project, descriptions of the program activities reported by the study communities, and a discussion of the activities associated with higher belt use. <u>Volume 2: Research Report</u> , provides detailed descriptions of the study methodology and results, tabulations of information on state programs, and charts showing activities conducted in case study communities. An appendix provides a review of 12 <u>Model Community Program Safety Belt Projects conducted in non-law or prelaw states.</u>					
17. Key Words safety belt use safety belt programs safety belt use law			18. Distribution Statement Available to the public through the National Technical Information Service Springfield, Virginia 22161		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages	22. Price

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many persons deserve thanks for their assistance to use in our efforts to analyze program activities associated with safety belt use. Dr. Jesse Blatt of NHTSA's Office of Driver and Pedestrian Research was the Technical Officer for this study, and we are extremely grateful for his advice, encouragement, and assistance throughout the research process. We also appreciate the assistance and advice of John Krause, Director of the State and Community Programs Division of Traffic Safety Programs and his staff. This report was typed by Linda Lee Ryden. We would especially like to thank those persons in the State offices and in the eight case study sites who freely and openly shared their time and their views with us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1 -- INTRODUCTION	1
Methodology	2
Case Study Communities	3
Program Activities	7
Analysis of Differences	10
Findings	10
Report Outline	11
2 -- PROGRAM ACTIVITIES REPORTED BY COMMUNITIES STUDIED	13
Media Efforts	14
Community Support	16
Public Information and Education	34
Employer Support	38
Enforcement	41
Relative Frequency of Use of Activities	44
3 -- ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH HIGHER BELT USE	51
Providing Messages for Specific Audiences	51
Maximizing Market Penetration	52
Enforcing Safety Belt Laws	56
APPENDIX A: Safety Belt Program Activities Used at the State Level	
APPENDIX B: Review of 12 Model Community Program Safety Belt Projects	

1

INTRODUCTION

Promoting safety belt use in passenger cars has been an item on the national agenda for 20 years. Lap belts have been standard equipment on passenger vehicles manufactured in the United States since 1968. The combined lap and shoulder belt has been standard since 1973. Federal funds have been available to states for promoting safety belt use since 1967.

Interest and action has accelerated in the 1980s. Since 1979, states have been required to earmark two percent of their 23 U.S.C. 402 funds for programs to encourage safety belt use. Currently, the use of passenger safety belts is mandated by legislation in over half the states and the District of Columbia.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of the U.S. Department of Transportation contracted with Ecosometrics, Incorporated to analyze program factors associated with safety belt use in states having laws requiring that safety belts be used in automobiles. The basic questions addressed in this study were:

- What program activities have been developed at the community level in those states currently mandating safety belt use?
- What relationship exists between the types and intensities of program activities and the degree of compliance with the laws mandating belt use?
- What program activities are frequently used at the state level in those states currently mandating safety belt use?
- What activities were used to encourage safety belt usage in communities that participated in NHTSA's Model Community Program which (in nearly all cases) preceded the passage of laws requiring the use of safety belts?

The text of this report focusses on information about the combinations of activities and the effectiveness of those activities at the community level to assist in the development of new programs and refinement of existing programs -- in other words, the first two questions listed above. State level activities are described in Appendix A to this report. Appendix B addresses the fourth question, that of the activities which occurred in those communities that participated in the Model Communities Program.

The study collected information about the combinations of activities and the effectiveness of those activities at the community level intended to increase the usage of safety belts. While focussing on patterns of association and correlation rather than proofs of causality, the conclusions reached here support the conclusions of similar previous research:¹ the greatest levels of safety belt usage were found in those communities that combined increased levels of enforcement with intense media campaigns. Several additional refinements were added to the previous knowledge. First, it appeared that the most useful measure of enforcement was the per capita conviction rate, which helped express the probability that a citizen might actually pay a fine for not wearing a safety belt; it had a substantially higher statistical association with safety belt usage than citation rate, which indicated the probability of receiving a ticket for belt non-use. Considering the conviction rate rather than the citation rate also underscored the key role of the judicial system in attempts to increase belt usage. Second, media campaigns in higher use communities showed careful attention to local details. The media campaigns found in higher belt use communities tailored campaigns to the demographic characteristics of the community, focussed on the major employers in the locality, and understood how the local market structure made some media efforts more productive than others in reaching the intended audience.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for this project included the following steps:

1. Creating an exhaustive list of over 30 potential program activities, based on lengthy conversations with state program administrators,

¹For example, see Debra H. Hood, Patricia P. Kraichy, and Jane A. Carman, Selective Traffic Enforcement Program: Final Report, State University of New York at Albany, April 1987; Brian A. Johan, Novey E. Dawson, et al., Evaluation of the Effects of a Selective Traffic Enforcement Program on Seat Belt Usage, Road and Motor Vehicle Traffic Safety Branch, Transport Canada, May 1981; Mike C. Lai and Harold S. Dalkie, "An Evaluation of a Selective Traffic Enforcement Program to Increase Seat Belt Use Rates in Manitoba," Canadian Multidisciplinary Road Safety Conference V: Proceedings, Calgary, Alberta; Grant A. Smith, "Development and Administration of a Community Seat Belt Enforcement and Education Campaign," Technical Memorandum 8001, Road Systems Division, Transport Canada, August, 1980; and Allan F. Williams, David F. Preusser, et al., "Results of a Seat Belt Use Law Enforcement and Publicity Campaign in Elmira, New York," Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Washington, D.C., March 1986.

2. selecting a sample of eight communities:
 - half with belt use over 50 percent, half with belt use under 50 percent;
 - geographic, demographic, and programmatic variations;
 - all with penalties for not using safety belts in effect for at least six months (i.e., the "maintenance phase"); and
 - all having available community level belt use data before and after time of the penalty;
3. collecting information about individual activities from the major providers of each activity (not just from program administrators), mostly by telephone and sometimes by on-site conversations, and
4. analyzing the differences between the higher use and lower use groups by comparing the activities of the group of communities with higher recorded belt use to those of the group of communities with lower recorded belt use in terms of participation, audience size, frequency, and time frame.

The limitations created by this methodology need to be understood, particularly when extrapolating findings from the case study communities to other localities. The basic approach was to search for statistically significant differences between two groups of communities, those with higher versus those with lower safety belt usage. The following data were to be recorded:

- difference in number of activities,
- difference in number of activities per each of the five program factor categories,
- difference in type of audiences approached,
- difference in sizes of audiences approached,
- difference in timing of activities,
- differences in number of repetitions,
- program administration factors (resource allocation, lead agency, length of program, existing grants, state and Federal involvement, task force/coalition involvement),
- community characteristics (region, population demographics, rank in order of when the safety belt law was enacted, primary vs. secondary enforcement, climate/weather conditions, major industry, dollar per capita public expenditures, percent public expenditures for highway programs),
- particular aspects of the law (types of community leaders involved in lobbying for the law, when the law was enacted, primary vs. secondary enforcements, size per capita and composition of police involved in issuing safety belt citations, adjudication process), and
- the interrelationships among the categories above.

In fact, it was not possible to find consistent data sources in all communities, sometimes because no one there had ever collected such data, sometimes because the person in charge had moved, and sometimes for other reasons. Furthermore, data were collected through secondary sources and interviews, and it was seldom possible to independently verify the accuracy of the data given (some of which were estimates instead of tabulations). The dependence on secondary sources meant that certain important data elements -- such as safety belt usage rates -- were not necessarily available for the same periods of time. Finally, because of the exploratory nature of this research, the findings described patterns of association rather than proofs of causality. Despite these limitations, it was agreed that the methodology chosen provided a reasonable first approach to collecting kinds of information that had not previously been qualified or collected, given the limited resources available. Future intensive data collection efforts can focus on the activities found in this study to be associated with increases in safety belt use.

CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES¹

The four communities in the higher belt use group were similar to those in the lower belt use group on many demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. Detailed characteristics of each of the case study communities are shown in Table 1-1. The communities selected varied in terms of safety belt program features, such as program funding, length of law's implementation, and distribution of primary and secondary law enforcement states. Among these communities, the differences between higher and lower belt use could not be ascribed to demographic, socioeconomic characteristics or other program features mentioned directly above. Similarities between the higher and lower belt use communities are shown in Table 1-2.

Higher Belt Use Communities

The four communities in the higher use group each recorded safety belt use over 50 percent, ranging from 51 percent to 77 percent. The four together included a total population of 412,871. Their individual population totals ranged from 35,000 to 258,000. One community was in the Northeast, one in the South, one in the West, and one in the Mid-West. Two of the communities were from the same states as a community in the lower use group. All but one had median household incomes lower than their state median; the fourth community median was only dollars higher than its state median. Two of the four communities had a higher percentage of high school graduates than their state as a whole. One had nearly the same percentage as its state and one had a slightly lower percentage of graduates than its state. One community had a substantial Hispanic population.

One community had in the past received a model comprehensive community grant and the grant task force continued to provide program coordination after the grant's termination. In one community, a district representative of the state highway traffic division served as the local program coordinator. In the other two communities, there was no organized coordination of local safety belt program activities.

¹A heightened degree of participation in this study was obtained by the assurance of anonymity to all participants. Therefore, specific communities will not be identified at any point.

Table 1-1: DETAILED CHARACTERISTICS OF CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

	Higher Belt Use Communities				Lower Belt Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Population	231,999	42,695	79,722	34,252	40,199	142,546	139,712	80,479
Percentage of Adults w/High School Degrees	61%	71%	73%	84%	48%	51%	67%	61%
Percentage of Adults w/High School Degrees in the State	63%	71%	73%	74%	67%	71%	67%	74%
Percentage of Population, Hispanic	47%	1%	2%	7%	6%	19%	3%	38%
Average Household Income in Community	\$16,799	\$13,486	\$14,620	\$13,112	\$ 9,807	\$13,852	\$18,419	\$17,352
Average Household Income in State	\$16,708	\$20,077	\$19,223	\$18,243	\$19,800	\$20,077	\$19,321	\$18,243
Type of Enforcement of Safety Belt Laws	primary	primary	secondary	secondary	secondary	primary	primary	secondary
Date Penalty for Safety Belt Violations Effective	12/1/85	2/1/86	7/1/85	1/1/86	3/1/85	2/1/86	7/1/85	1/1/86
Funding: Recipient of Major Grant or Not	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Had Coordinator for Prog.	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Percent of Drivers Wearing Safety Belts	66%	72%	55%	55%	19%	30%	36%	46%
Improvement in Belt Usage Rate by Absolute Percent	52.5%	22.3%	23.5%	27.1%	10%	N.A.	23.1%	25.9%

Table 1-2

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HIGHER BELT USE GROUP AND
THE LOWER BELT USE GROUP OF CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

Community and Program Characteristics	Higher Use Communities	Lower Use Communities
<u>Demographics</u>		
Total Population	412,871	403,038
Range of Population	35,000 - 258,000	37,000 - 137,880
Income Level	3 communities < state median 1 community > state median	4 communities < state median
Educational Level (percent of the population that graduated from high school)	1 community < state percent 1 community = state percent 2 communities > state percent	3 communities < state percent 1 community = state percent
Significant Minority Population	1 community with large Hispanic population	1 community with large Hispanic population
Geographical Region	1 community in Northeast 1 community in West 1 community in Mid-West 1 community in South	1 community in Northeast 1 community in West 1 community in Mid-West 1 community in East
<u>Program Characteristics</u>		
Major Grants ¹	1 community	2 communities
No Local Program Coordination	2 communities	2 communities
Local Coordination by State Representative	1 community	
<u>Aspects of the Safety Belt Law</u>		
Primary Enforcement	2 communities	2 communities
Secondary Enforcement	2 communities	2 communities

¹"Major grants" ranged from model community grants of approximately \$40,000 to grants that paid for a program coordinator and some administrative help.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Two of the communities were in states with primary enforcement of the safety belt laws and two were in states with secondary enforcement.

Lower Belt Use Communities

The four communities in the lower use group each recorded safety belt use under 50 percent, ranging from 19 percent to 36.4 percent. The four together included a total population of 403,038. Their individual population totals ranged from 37,000 to 137,000. All four communities had populations with median household incomes lower than their state medians. Three of the communities had lower percentages of high school graduates than their state percentages and one had the same as its state's percentage. One community included a large Hispanic population. One community was in the Northeast, one in the West, one in the Mid-West, and one in the East.

Two communities had major safety belt program grants and two communities had no organized local program coordination. Two communities had safety belt use laws with primary enforcement and two had use laws with secondary enforcement.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Over 30 program activities were systematically examined and analyzed in five program categories¹ (see Table 1-3). Depending on the type of factor and the data available, some were measured only in terms of participation versus non-participation; others were also measured in terms of intensity of activity. When the consideration of who performed each activity was added to the analysis, it created a potential list of over 150 program activities by specific participants. The five major categories of activities examined were:

- Community Support: For the purposes of this study, community support was defined as those activities by community workers and leaders which may contribute to creating an atmosphere in which safety belt use is seen as "the thing to do." Community support activities included media appearances, lobbying, and seminars. Besides participation in activities, community support also included the encouragement, prodding, and soliciting of agents to perform community activities.
- Employer Support: This category included activities sponsored by employers (in both the public and private sector) primarily for the benefit of their employees, including employee policies on belt use, internal educational efforts, and specific incentive or disincentive programs.

¹Initial contacts with state officials produced a slightly different set of categories (see Appendix A, page A-3). As a result of the research process at the state level, media efforts became a separate category and enforcement and adjudication were combined.

Table 1-3

SAFETY BELT PROMOTION ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED IN CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

Activities	Participating Communities							
	Higher Use Communities				Lower Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
<u>Media</u>								
PSAs - Newspaper			x			x		x
PSAs - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
PSAs - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Paid Ads - Radio	x	x	x	x			x	
Paid Ads - T.V.	x	x	x					x
Paid Ads - Newspaper						x		
News stories - Newspaper	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
News stories - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
News stories - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Accident accounts - Newspaper	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Accident accounts - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Accident accounts - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	x	na	x
Talk shows - Radio	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
Talk shows - T.V.	x	x						x
<u>Community Support</u>								
Distribution of Materials	x		x	x	x		x	x
Media Appearances	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Directives	x		x		x			x
Coalition Membership					x		x	x
Lobbying	x		x	x	x	x		
Seminar Attendance	x		x	x	x		x	x
"Saved by the Belt"			x				x	
<u>Employer Support</u>								
Belt Use Policy - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Belt Use Policy - Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Internal Education - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Internal Education - Government	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Incentive Programs - Corporate			x		x	x	x	
Incentive Programs - Government			x					
Disincentives - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Disincentives - Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	

na - Data were not available.

Table 1-3 (continued)

Activities	Participating Communities							
	Higher Use Communities				Lower Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
<u>PI&E</u>								
Billboards, Signs	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	
Brochures, Posters	x	na	x	x		na	x	x
Gimmicks	x	na	x			na	x	x
Classroom Presentations	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Displays and Demonstrations		na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Driver's Manual	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Envelope Stuffers		na	x			na	x	
Films		na	x	x		na	x	x
Newsletters	x	na	x			na	x	x
<u>Enforcement</u>								
Community Outreach								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
-- State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Departmental Belt-Use Policy								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x	na	na	x	
-- State Police	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Departmental Belt Non-Use Policy Disincentives								
-- Local Police	x	x	na	x	na	na	x	
-- State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Internal Education								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x	na	x		x
-- State Police	na	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Written Warnings								
-- Local Police		x						
-- State Police		x	x			x	x	
Primary Citations								
-- Local Police	x							
-- State Police								
Secondary Citations								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
-- State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

na - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

- Media Efforts: Five activities through each of three media -- newspaper, radio and television -- were examined and analyzed for differences between the higher and lower use groups in terms of participation in and intensity of various activities, including public service announcements (PSAs), paid ads, news reports, belt use status in accident accounts, and talk shows. Thirteen newspapers (seven from higher use communities, six from lower use), 43 radio stations (25 higher use, 18 lower use), and 31 television stations (17 higher use, 14 lower use) were contacted from the eight case study communities.
- Public Information and Education Efforts: Public information and education (PI&E) efforts were defined as those using graphic, written, or spoken presentation of educational information to reach both general and specific audiences, such as billboards, signs, brochures, posters, classroom, community presentations, displays, demonstrations, driver's manuals, envelope stuffers, films, or newsletters. PI&E did not include efforts conducted through the use of television, radio, or newspaper.
- Enforcement and Adjudication Efforts: The enforcement and adjudication efforts that were examined included traffic citations for safety belt violations, fines for conviction of safety belt law violations, staffing of enforcement activities, community outreach by officers, belt use status on accident reports, department belt use policy, department belt non-use disincentives, and training of officers and judges.

ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES

Activities within each of the five program areas -- community support, employer support, media, PI&E, and enforcement and adjudication -- were examined for their ability to explain the level of safety belt usage in a particular community. The analytical techniques used included pattern analysis, Fisher's exact probability metric test, the Chi-square test and the differences of proportions test.

FINDINGS

The examination and analysis of the differences in program activities between communities with higher belt use and communities with lower use produced two major findings. First, three factors -- the nature and use of the local media market, specific audience types, and local enforcement of belt use laws -- set the higher use communities apart from the lower use communities.

A community's ability or willingness to distinguish and target specific audiences or to tailor programs to identified subgroups within the overall population appeared useful in distinguishing higher belt use communities from lower belt use communities. Higher belt use communities more often tailored their media programs to fit the demographic influences of language, literacy rates, and special audiences than did lower use communities. In higher use communities, employees who drove as part of their job were also more specifically targeted. In higher use communities, larger shares of the local media market were being reached with safety belt messages by working with media providers for maximum exposure and by devising media campaigns that would intelligently respond to the structural conditions of the local media market.

Enforcement of safety belt laws was strongly associated with safety belt usage in the communities examined. Rankings of per capita safety belt convictions matched almost exactly the rankings of increases of safety belt usage in each of the communities; conviction rates (the number of citations for safety belt violations resulting in fines divided by the total number of citations) in higher belt use communities were substantially higher than in lower use communities. To increase belt usage, police need to give safety belt citations and judges need to uphold them.

Second, aside from these three factors, a community's use of one program activity over another activity did not appear to be associated with belt usage rates. Those findings are discussed in detail in the following two chapters.

REPORT OUTLINE

Chapter 2 describes the state of the art in safety belt use promotion. It defines and describes the activities that were conducted in the communities in each of the five program areas -- community support, employer support, media, PI&E, and enforcement and adjudication. This chapter then discusses activities in terms of frequency of usage -- activities conducted in nearly all communities, activities conducted in about half the communities, and activities conducted in only a few communities -- thus establishing what might be called a basic level of safety belt use promotion activities among various communities. Chapter 3 describes three activities that were found to be associated with higher belt use and presents observations on how communities might use those findings in building their programs.

2

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES REPORTED BY COMMUNITIES STUDIED

This chapter discusses activities which were used at the community level in programs to promote safety belt use. Activities were classified by the study team into five categories: media, public information and education (PI&E), community support, employer support, and enforcement. This chapter examines the activities by provider grouping in the five categories. Each category's discussion concludes with an analysis of the usage of the activities in that category. Several activities were statistically associated with higher belt usage communities or communities where belt usage rates had significantly increased; they will be discussed in the next chapter.

Some activities were more widely used than other activities in the communities in this study. (An activity was listed as tried in a community if one or more providers did that activity.) Not all activities were performed in every community. Some activities were done by most communities, some by about half the communities, and a few were done by only a small number of the communities. Tabulations of activities by frequency are provided at the end of the chapter.

The participation or non-participation in any particular activity had several possible causes. An activity might be so entrenched or effortless that stopping it would free few resources for other projects. The activity might also have been needed in the community or needed to build a base from which other activities developed. For activities conducted in only some or a few of the communities, a reevaluation on a community-by-community basis might increase the effective allocation of resources and efforts for local safety belt promotion programs. In some cases, though, the choice of an uncommon activity represented a coordinator's decision to develop a program for specific populations, which took into account demographic characteristics such as minority populations, literacy rates, ages, and major employers in a particular community.

MEDIA EFFORTS

Media activities encompassed five activities: public service announcements (PSA's), paid ads, news stories, belt wearing status in accident accounts, and talk shows. Television and radio stations performed all five activities while newspapers did everything but talk shows.

Some problems occurred in obtaining the data desired because of the high level of personal mobility in media positions. This was particularly true for TV personnel. The result was that not as much quantifiable data (particularly regarding the total number of times particular messages were aired or printed) was obtained as desired, since many of the currently available media contacts had not held those particular positions during the focal points of the safety belt campaigns. This observation suggests the need for continual media contacts by safety belt campaign personnel to ensure effective program coverage.

Types of Activities

PSA's

PSA's for television and radio ranged from five-second simple messages of buckle-up to 60-second nationally produced and distributed announcements. The content ranged from information about the law to emotional appeals and direct requests for safety belt use. Television and radio PSA's included the Vince and Larry series and radio PSAs included emotional pleas of Barbara Mandrel and "Tracey's Song." (Vince and Larry are the talking crash dummies who recommend safety belt use in materials produced by NHTSA and designed by the National Advertising Council. Tracey's Song was composed by the father of a teenager killed in a car accident and details the future she will miss.)

PSAs used on the radio ranged from nationally-produced spots to unrehearsed messages by disk jockeys formulated from press releases from local area programs. PSAs were aired most often just before and just after passage of the law mandating safety belt usage. Many PSAs were produced for one locality and then distributed through a state or region if the PSA gained popularity. Some radio stations reported using them as often as twice a day, while others used them only several times a week or less often. Radio PSAs also included the quick buckle-up message delivered by the D.J. following a traffic report.

Newspaper PSAs often came from National Advertising Council Campaign materials. The Vince and Larry ad series was often used by newspapers as their PSA's.

Paid Ads

Paid ads used on radio and television were generally sponsored by car dealerships, and sometimes insurance companies. They coincided with the dealership's commercial promotions. They usually were used for a specified time period during a particular sales campaign. One community received an experimental grant for a pilot program to conduct a paid ad campaign on the radio. Only one newspaper reported paid ads and these particular ads were produced as part of a sales campaign by a car dealership.

News Stories

News stories were presented in local newspapers, radio stations and network television and most often included reports on the formulation, debate, and passage of the legislation and on the law's enforcement. In several communities reporters had their own "saved by the belt" experience or other reasons for deep personal commitment to promoting safety belt use. In other cases, the community task force had established regular communications with various media contacts. The task force or coalition often kept in contact with the separate reporters who cover accidents and the reporters who cover health and safety issues in addition to editors who determine paper or station policy. That communication channel included press releases, newsletters, and, PI&E packets and often involved direct contact by the program coordinator or a task force member.

Safety belt wearing had the greatest exposure as the laws were legislated and put into effect. Sometimes a week-long series of articles or a 5-10 minute television segment was used to describe the law and its enforcement. Local television network affiliates tended to include safety belt news during the local news segments which often varied in length and content depending on the community. Radio news time was generally limited and less dependent on direct local reporting. Newspapers with section devoted to local events provided a popular vehicle for safety belt news. News stories were rare after the initial period when the law is enacted and generally occurred only when the community took stock of its efforts on the anniversary of the passage of the law or when the community created a media event such as a community-wide "safety belt challenge."

Belt Use Status in Accident Accounts

Belt use status was included in accident accounts reported in all three media -- newspaper, radio, and television. The inclusion of safety belt status in an accident account often depended on the policies of the newspaper or station and the accessibility of belt status information. The paper or station might have, as a matter of policy, reported only fatalities, only serious accidents, or all of them. A general policy was for them to include belt use status for those accidents they did report and for which information was available. Accessibility to belt use status information was dependent on police department policy. Reporters for various media appreciated accident accounts that mentioned the degree of injuries or number of deaths due specifically to not wearing safety belts.

Talk Shows

Radio and television talk shows focused on the legislation that made safety belts mandatory. Safety belts were first a topic when talk show guest debated the pros and cons of laws that make them mandatory. Coverage of the law's enactment and enforcement was left mostly to news programs. Occasionally, safety belt air as a topic with the passage of the law itself or the anniversary of the law. Additionally, when appearing on talk shows, enforcement officials often mentioned safety belt benefits and statistics.

Radio and television talk shows on safety belts did not air frequently due to the effort and resources required. Many television and radio programming people considered talk shows about safety belts as one-time only events. Television talk shows tended to occupy half-hour slots while radio talk shows typically lasted 15 minutes.

Analysis

Of the basic media activities, nine were performed in most communities, three were used in about half the communities, and one was done in a few communities. Table 2-1 gives the participation figures of safety belt activities by the various media. Table 2-2 shows the sizes of audiences reached, while Table 2-3 gives the population sizes for each community's media market (each according to figures coupled by Arbitron, Inc. for the fall of 1986). Table 2-4 gives the relative exposure of safety belt activities by the media in high and low use communities. Responses from 13 newspapers, (seven in higher use communities, six in lower use), 43 radio stations (25 higher use, 18 lower use), and 31 television stations (17 higher use, 14 lower use) were accumulated. Higher belt use communities were compared to low use communities in terms of participation in each activity audience size, frequency, and time frame. There were no significant differences between the higher and lower use communities in terms of which activities were used or in terms of how the activity was conducted, how frequently or whether or not it was conducted during the maintenance phase. Two media activities did show up as significantly different between lower and higher communities: maximizing market penetration, and tailoring and targeting messages to specific audiences. These measures will be explained in the next chapter.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Community support activities were media appearances, directives, coalition (or task force) membership, lobbying, attending seminars, distributing materials, serving as role models, and donating time or money. Leaders in the community such as politicians, entertainment/sports figures, news reporters helped safety belt publicity by media appearances, acted as role models, and gave donations of time and resources.¹ Public interest groups, churches, local auto clubs and many other groups listed on Table 2-5 also contributed to community support activities. Four activities that were often the focus of community support activities -- distribution of materials, media appearances, directives, coalition (task force) membership, seminar attendance, lobbying, and "saved by the belt" testimonials -- are explained in more detail below. Discussions of the sources of support -- politicians, public interest groups, the medical community, automobile-related people, churches, and entertainers and sports figures -- follow the discussion of activities. Table 2-5 is structured to show which providers did each activity over all of the eight study sites. Tables 2-6 through 2-13 show the providers of each activity for each community; these tables show the wide range of activities at the eight sites.

¹In particular, law enforcement officials made substantial contributions of volunteer time, especially to participate in safety demonstrations and other coalition/task force activities.

Table 2-1

DETAILED PARTICIPATION FIGURES FOR MEDIA ACTIVITIES

(Fractions represent the number of stations or papers who participated in the activity over the number of stations or papers contacted in each community.)

	High Belt Use Communities				Low Belt Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D*	E	F	G	H
PSAs								
Newspapers			1/2			1/1		2/3
Radio Stations	2/4	3/3	4/4	3/5	1/3	2/2		4/5
T.V. Stations	4/7	5/6	3/3	2/2	2/2	1/2	2/2	3/3
Paid Ads								
Newspapers						1/1		
Radio Stations	2/8	1/6	2/5	2/6			2/5	
T.V. Stations	1/5	2/4	1/3					1/3
News Stories								
Newspapers	1/2	3/3	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1		3/3
Radio Stations	2/6	2/3	1/3	3/3	2/3	1/1	3/5	5/6
T.V. Stations	1/2	3/6	2/3	5/6	1/1	NA	2/5	3/3
Accident Accounts								
Newspapers	1/2	3/3	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	3/3
Radio Stations	6/8	2/3	3/3	5/6	3/3	1/2	4/5	5/6
T.V. Stations	4/4	3/6	3/3	3/3	2/2	NA	3/5	3/3
Talk Shows								
Radio Stations	5/9	2/3	2/4		1/3	1/3	2/4	3/5
T.V. Stations	1/3	4/4						2/3

*For Community D, there were no viewership or listenership data available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Table 2-2: SIZE OF AUDIENCE REACHED BY MEDIA EVENTS

	Higher Use Communities				Lower Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D**	E	F	G	H
PSAs								
Paper	43,000	0	62,354	0	0	77,789	0	10,000
Radio*	14,900	70,700	9,400	NA	3,600	11,800	7,600	10,800
T.V.	14,388	84,280	58,800	NA	501,866	NA	36,690	33,930
Paid Ads								
Paper	0	0	0	0	0	77,789	0	0
Radio*	6,100	70,400	7,800	NA	0	0	14,000	0
T.V.	17,985	6,020	25,200	NA	0	NA	0	13,195
News Reports								
Paper	68,675	31,733	62,354	10,000	78,340	77,789	0	36,500
Radio*	7,400	69,100	4,300	NA	5,300	0	31,798	22,620
T.V.	53,955	66,220	75,600	NA	369,796	21,900	16,500	12,700
Accident Accounts								
Paper	68,675	31,773	62,354	10,000	78,340	77,789	71,429	36,500
Radio*	12,100	69,100	5,100	NA	9,500	10,800	16,700	8,400
T.V.	61,149	66,220	92,400	NA	660,350	NA	48,920	6,100
Talk Shows								
Radio*	5,500	69,100	4,900	NA	1,700	10,100	1,000	8,400
T.V.	1,199	51,170	0	NA	0	0	0	24,505

*All radio numbers represent people reached in the community over 18.

**For Community D, there were no viewership or listenership data available.

NA - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Arbitron, Incorporated (fall 1986).

Table 2-3: HOUSEHOLDS WITHIN THE GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES OF THE MEDIA MARKETS

	Higher Use Communities				Lower Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D**	E	F	G	H
PSAs								
Paper	76,661	113,649	585,100	13,760	232,457	280,597	99,322	110,100
Radio*	249,900	788,200	161,400	NA	160,000	331,800	203,600	243,700
T.V.	121,500	305,800	426,200	NA	2,277,700	NA	124,300	196,400
Paid Ads								
Paper	76,661	113,649	585,100	13,760	232,457	280,597	99,322	110,100
Radio*	249,900	788,200	161,400	NA	160,000	331,800	203,600	243,700
T.V.	121,500	205,800	426,200	NA	2,677,700	NA	124,300	196,400
News Reports								
Paper	76,661	113,649	585,100	13,760	232,457	280,597	99,322	110,100
Radio*	249,900	788,200	161,400	NA	160,000	331,800	203,600	243,700
T.V.	121,500	505,800	426,200	NA	2,677,700	NA	124,300	196,400
Accident Accounts								
Paper	76,661	113,649	585,100	13,760	232,457	280,597	99,322	110,100
Radio*	249,900	788,200	161,400	NA	160,000	331,800	203,600	243,700
T.V.	121,500	505,800	426,200	NA	2,677,700	NA	124,300	196,400
Talk Shows								
Radio*	249,900	788,200	161,400	NA	160,000	331,800	203,600	243,700
T.V.	121,500	505,800	426,200	NA	2,677,700	NA	124,300	196,400

*All radio numbers represent people in the community over 18.

**For Community D, there were no viewership or listenership data available.

NA - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Arbitron, Incorporated (fall 1986).

Table 2-4

SAFETY BELT INFORMATION PROVIDED BY VARIOUS MEDIA

Activity	Relative Usage by Media Type		
	Newspapers	T.V. Stations	Radio Stations
PSAs	**	***	***
Paid Ads	*	**	**
News Stories	***	***	***
Accident Accounts	***	***	***
Talk Shows		**	***

Key:

- *** Activities performed in most communities
- ** Activities performed in about 1/2 of communities
- * Activities performed in few communities
- [blank] Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated

Table 2-5: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT ALL CASE STUDY SITES

Community Support Activities

Possible Agents for Activities	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Entertainment/Sports Figures	X	X					X
News Reporters	X	X			X		X
Public Interest Groups	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Churches		X	X	X			
Auto Clubs	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Local Service Clubs			X	X	X		
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies	X	X		X	X	X	
Medical Personnel	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Driver Education Instructors	X		X	X	X		
Auto Sales and Service People	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Rental Car Personnel	X						

Table 2-6: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE A

Possible Agents For Activities	Community Support Activities						
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders		X	X			X	
Entertainment/Sports Figures		X					
News Reporters					X	X	
Public Interest Groups	X						
Churches		X					
Auto Clubs							
Local Service Clubs							
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies							
Medical Personnel	X		X				
Driver Education Instructors			X				
Auto Sales and Service People	X		X				
Rental Car Personnel							

Table 2-7: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE B

Possible Agents For Activities	Community Support Activities						
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders		X					
Entertainment/Sports Figures							
News Reporters							
Public Interest Groups		X					
Churches							
Auto Clubs							
Local Service Clubs							
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies							
Medical Personnel							
Driver Education Instructors							
Auto Sales and Service People							
Rental Car Personnel							

Table 2-8: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE C

Possible Agents For Activities	Community Support Activities						
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders	X	X				X	
Entertainment/Sports Figures	X	X					
News Reporters							
Public Interest Groups	X	X	X	X	X		
Churches			X				
Auto Clubs	X		X	X			
Local Service Clubs	X		X		X		
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies				X			
Medical Personnel	X		X	X	X	X	X
Driver Education Instructors	X		X	X	X		
Auto Sales and Service People							
Rental Car Personnel							

Table 2-9: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE D

Possible Agents For Activities	Community Support Activities						
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders							
Entertainment/Sports Figures							
News Reporters	X						
Public Interest Groups	X						
Churches							
Auto Clubs							
Local Service Clubs							
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies							
Medical Personnel	X						
Driver Education Instructors							
Auto Sales and Service People	X	X			X		X
Rental Car Personnel	X						

Table 2-10: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE E

Possible Agents For Activities	Community Support Activities						
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders	X	X			X		
Entertainment/Sports Figures							
News Reporters			X		X		
Public Interest Groups	X	X					
Churches							
Auto Clubs	X	X	X		X	X	
Local Service Clubs							
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies	X		X				X
Medical Personnel		X	X				X
Driver Education Instructors	X				X		
Auto Sales and Service People	X		X				X
Rental Car Personnel			X				

Table 2-11: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE F

Possible Agents For Activities	Community Support Activities						
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders		X				X	
Entertainment/Sports Figures							
News Reporters							
Public Interest Groups							
Churches							
Auto Clubs							
Local Service Clubs							
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies							
Medical Personnel							
Driver Education Instructors							
Auto Sales and Service People							
Rental Car Personnel							

Table 2-12: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE G

Possible Agents For Activities	Community Support Activities						Saved by the Belt
	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	
Political Leaders		X		X	X		X
Entertainment/Sports Figures		X					
News Reporters		X					
Public Interest Groups	X			X			
Churches							
Auto Clubs	X						
Local Service Clubs							
Chambers of Commerce							
Insurance Companies	X	X					
Medical Personnel	X						
Driver Education Instructors							
Auto Sales and Service People				X			X
Rental Car Personnel	X						

Table 2-13: COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES AT CASE STUDY SITE H

Community Support Activities

Possible Agents For Activities	Distributing Materials	Media Appearances	Issuing Directives	Coalition (Task Force) Membership	Attending Seminars	Lobbying	Saved by the Belt
Political Leaders		X		X			
Entertainment/Sports Figures							
News Reporters			X		X		
Public Interest Groups	X	X	X	X	X		
Churches			X				
Auto Clubs	X				X		
Local Service Clubs			X		X		
Chambers of Commerce			X		X		
Insurance Companies							
Medical Personnel	X	X		X	X		
Driver Education Instructors			X				
Auto Sales and Service People				X	X		
Rental Car Personnel							

Types of Community Support Activities

Media Appearances

Media appearances consisted primarily of PSAs and speeches. The PSAs had politicians, news reporters, medical personnel and church officials as the message presenters. Public interest groups, auto clubs, the Red Cross and media providers often produced and distributed the PSAs. Publicized speeches included excerpts from press conferences and belt wearing challenge kick-off events.

Issuing Directives

Directives ranged from company memos dictating belt use policy to articles in local service club newsletters reminding members to buckle up. Encouraged by safety belt promotions, church leaders often pleaded with their followers to wear safety belts while physicians contributed to safety literature about some of the atrocities they had seen in emergency rooms.

Distributing Materials

Distribution of materials encompassed many of the possible agents examined in community support. The Red Cross and Auto Club produced much of their own campaign material and distributed it to many organizations who then distributed the material to individuals. Driver education instructors and physicians usually received material from local coalitions, task forces, enforcement officials, and service clubs, who had received the materials from larger umbrella organizations. Other small distribution points included organizations such as Chambers of Commerce, rental car agencies, and auto sales and repair shops.

Local Coalition Memberships

Local coalitions or task forces had originally been supported in part by grant monies. Their structures were often formal, including subcommittees and specific jobs for various members. The American Red Cross and a county public health department had been the grant recipients in the three communities with local coalitions. Coalitions coordinated community and high school safety belt challenges, employer support efforts, public demonstrations and displays, educational efforts for school children, and sometimes even coordinated the community's belt usage observational surveys. Coalition members included politicians, representatives of public interest groups, such as MADD, National Safety Council, and the PTA, corporate representatives, people in automobile-related positions (such as driver education instructors and car dealers), doctors and nurses, police officers, and, in one case, a court official. In two communities, police officials had wanted to recruit judges and other adjudication officials into the coalition to help carry out the enforcement of safety belt violations. These two particular communities had a high level of safety belt violations which judges had dismissed.

Lobbying

Many individuals lobbied in support of passage of their state safety belt law. Those involved in lobbying the legislature included local politicians, driver education instructors, insurance company representatives, doctors, nurses, and police officers.

Seminars

Safety belt seminars generally involved various providers of community support, including police officers, coming together for a series of half- or one-day workshops and discussions. Sometimes safety belt use was only one topic on an agenda that also included drunk driving and/or child safety seat uses. The timing of the seminars was usually shortly before or after passage of the safety belt law and the content included information on the law and its enforcement. Seminars at other times had more of an injury prevention or health and safety focus.

"Saved-by-the-Belt" Testimonials

"Saved by the belt" testimonials came from two sources in this study. In one case, candidates for making "saved by the belt" statements were identified at accident sites by police officers. In the other, "saved by the belt" dinners were held in various corporate settings.

Analysis of Community Support Activities

Community support activities were often provided by auto-related persons and the medical community of their own volition. Assessing the strength of that existing commitment by the medical community and those in automobile-related industries, plus entertainers and sports figures, was a step toward increasing community support. Another step was to investigate the existence of information dissemination mechanisms such as a federation of churches. An additional consideration was the fact that the seminars and lobbying efforts reported revolved around either passage of or elements of the legislation.

Of the seven basic community support activities listed in Table 2-14, one was performed in most communities, five were done in about half of the communities, and one was done in only a few instances. Table 2-5 shows these activities as well as the supporters of the different activities done in the communities. Of the five types of supporters of community activities, two were found in most communities and three in about half the communities. For each of the eight communities, responses from program coordinators (or other persons able to give an overview in communities without coordinated programs) were analyzed. The analysis for these activities involved a visual examination of the differences in patterns of participation vs. non-participation in the eight activities between high and low use communities. No specific kind of activity was more likely to occur in high communities than in low-use communities.

Supporters in the Communities

Politicians

Politicians, particularly mayors and sheriffs, appeared eager to support safety belt use to their constituents. Most often that support was provided through media appearances.

Table 2-14

COMMUNITY SUPPORT ACTIVITIES OBSERVED

Activities and Supporters	Relative Frequency
<u>Activities</u>	
Distributing Materials	**
Media Appearances	***
Issuing Directives	**
Local Coalition Memberships	**
Lobbying	**
"Saved by the Belt" Testimonials	*
Seminar Attendance	**
<u>Supporters</u>	
Automobile-related People	**
Churches, Entertainers and Sports Figures	**
Medical Community	**
Politicians	***
Public Interest Groups	***

Key:

- *** Activities performed or supporters found in most communities
- ** Activities performed or supporters found in about half of the communities
- * Activities performed or supporters found in a few communities
- [blank] Activities not performed or supporters not found

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Public Interest Groups

Public interest groups, such as Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD), Students Against Drunk Drivers (SADD), Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID), the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), Rotary Club, the Kiwanis Club, the National Safety Council, and the Homemakers Club, provided support in most communities. That support often involved distributing materials produced by the organization itself or produced by a large umbrella organization and then filtered down to the community.

Churches, Entertainers and Sports Figures

Some types of providers of community support were thought by program coordinators to be the most likely people and groups to have access to segments of the population which are difficult to reach otherwise. Those providers included churches, entertainers, and sports figures. In some communities, program coordinators were able to tap into federations or associations of churches, thereby establishing a central distribution point for safety belt materials to congregations within a regional area. In other cases, representatives of particular churches were already established as contacts in the community on other social issues and therefore presumed approachable and reliable for distributing safety belt material. In one case, a church official participated in a PSA. Entertainers providing community support included national figures such as Barbara Mandrel, whose emotional plea for belt use after her highly publicized car accident was replayed on the television news in several communities. Locally known radio and television personalities and several newspaper reporters also made special media appearances, beyond their usual media capacity, to support safety belt use in the community. Sports figures offering support included a football star from a professional team in a nearby urban area. Entertainers and sports figures initiated and executed their support activities without much, if any, outside coordination.

Automobile-Related People

Representatives of the American Automobile Association (AAA), car insurance companies, car dealerships, and rental car companies, along with driver education instructors, provided community support through media appearances and material distribution in about half the case study communities. Some insurance companies and auto clubs included their own safety belt promotion materials as envelop stuffers with policy and membership renewal notices respectively. Car dealers sold cars which included "Buckle-Up" stickers on the dashboard from the factory. One dealership included safety belt use in their customer representative's presentation on specific features of their car for new owners. Major rental companies were including a message informing people about the law on rental car contracts in those states having laws requiring belt use and sometimes provided written materials at the rental counter.

Driver education instructors often included pro-safety belt messages to their students, sometimes distributed whole packets of materials to their students, and occasionally sent materials home to the students' families.

Medical Community

Although not reported in all case study communities, the involvement of doctors and nurses was extensive for those communities where it was reported.

Private physicians, particularly pediatricians, displayed brochures and posters, issued "prescriptions" for safety belt use, and made personal appearances on radio and television shows, at shopping malls and fairs and other places where they could deliver their message. Emergency room personnel made particularly poignant statements which were captured on radio and television and in the paper.

PUBLIC INFORMATION EDUCATION (PI&E)

Various forms of PI&E were combined to form nine activity categories for examination: billboards and signs, brochures and posters, gimmicks, classroom presentations, community displays and demonstrations, driver's manuals, envelope stuffers, films and newsletters. Responses from the program coordinators or others able to give an overview in communities without coordinated programs were tabulated for the study. The exposure of the different activities are shown on Table 2-15 on a per community basis.

Specific PI&E Activities

Billboards, Signs

The posting of billboards and signs carrying a "buckle-up message" were reported posted in rest areas, along county highways, and at local high schools. In one community, a community buckle-up message was created on marquee boards at local businesses where the marquee boards reached an estimated 10,000 people in a one week period. Other techniques were estimated to have reached audiences of about 500 persons per week.

Brochures, Posters

Brochures and posters were produced and distributed by local, state, and national organizations. They included titles such as "Fairy Tales," "No Time to React," "Myths and Facts" and the American Red Cross's "Buckle-Up." They were distributed through the Red Cross, neighborhood groups, the welcome wagon, health clinics, doctors' offices, Kiwanis and Rotary clubs, and local businesses and churches. Estimates of audience size generally ranged from 30 at local meetings to 200 on counters at local business. It was reported that from four to ten posters were being placed in buildings in cooperating corporations, banks, hotels, and health departments. Doctors also were willing to place posters in their offices. Some posters included original drawings by children in the community. The Vince and Larry posters from NHTSA were also mentioned.

Gimmicks

Gimmicks that included bookmarks, coloring books, key chains, litter bags, placemats, "prescriptions", and stickers were distributed at safety fairs and local malls by the same groups that produced brochures and posters. Audiences estimates for the different distribution points ranged from 20 at a local nursery school to 150 at a local business to thousands of health fairs, craft shows, and through doctor's offices and local service groups.

Table 2-15

PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

	Higher Belt Use Communities				Lower Belt Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Billboards, Signs	x	NA	x	x	x	NA	x	
Brochures, Posters	x	NA	x	x		NA	x	x
Gimmicks	x	NA	x			NA	x	x
Classroom Presentations	x	NA	x	x	x	NA	x	x
Displays and Demonstrations		NA	x	x	x	NA	x	x
Driver's Manual	x	NA	x	x	x	NA	x	x
Envelope Stuffers		NA	x			NA	x	
Films		NA	x	x		NA	x	x
Newsletters	x	NA	x			NA	x	x

NA - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Classroom Presentations

Presentations to school children from nursery school to high school ranged from "Buckle-Up Buddy" and a robot advocating safety belt use, funded by McDonalds Restaurants, to presentations by state troopers, task force members or driver education instructors. Various props and speakers were used to cover whole school districts so that each student was generally exposed only once to the presentation but continued to be exposed to materials left in the classroom from the presentation. These were almost always local efforts with curriculum guidance and occasional packets provided to the local schools by the State Office of Education.

Community Displays/Demonstrations

Presentations usually involved a fold-up table top display for use at fairs and in malls. Those had almost always been created with funds from a grant. Some of the same speakers and props used in the school presentations were also part of many community presentations. Another popular prop at fairs and malls and other crowded places was The Convincer, a crash impact simulator. A person sitting in the simulator, using a fastened safety belt, travels at a few miles an hour and suddenly stops as in an accident. The estimated audiences ranged from 50 at meetings to 5,000 at fairs.

Driver's Manuals

Specific techniques included materials in the State driver's manuals and other driver licensing or renewal materials, a question on the safety belt law on the driver's test, materials such as brochures on the counter where new and renewing drivers were processed, or posters on the wall nearby.

Envelope Stuffers

Envelope stuffing appeared in two communities. In one case it was material sent with paychecks to employees in a public agency. The audience was all paid public employees and the frequency was irregular. In the other case, material was stuffed in with license renewals. In that case, all those people in the community renewing their licenses during the year received some safety belt material at least once.

Films

Films were generally used with school children in preschools, high schools and after school activities. Sometimes they were used by employers. "Room to Live" was one film reported by title. The AAA and state police tended to use films in their school and community presentations. Audience size was estimated at between 15 and 150 per sitting.

Newsletters

Newsletters were sent to the community leaders and activists. Some were mailed monthly, others quarterly. Two included summaries of safety belt use and/or safety belt citation statistics. They were only reported in communities with a program coordinator.

Analysis

Of the basic PI&E activities, eight were performed in some communities, and one was done by only a few communities. Table 2-16 shows the relative exposure to safety belt information provided by public information and education efforts. The analysis for PI&E involved a visual examination of the differences in patterns of use or non-use of these nine categories of vehicles for delivering PI&E between high use and low use communities. There were no apparent differences in choices of one PI&E activity over another.

Table 2-16

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING SAFETY BELT USE

Activities	Relative Usage
Billboards, Signs	**
Brochures, Posters	**
Gimmicks	**
Classroom Presentations	**
Displays and Demonstrations	**
Driver's Manual	**
Envelope Stuffers	*
Films	**
Newsletters	**

Key:

- *** Activities performed in most communities
- ** Activities performed in about 1/2 the communities
- * Activities performed in few communities
- [blank] Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

EMPLOYER SUPPORT

Employer support activities fell into two separate groupings of providers: corporate employers and government employers. Government employers included enforcement agencies. Employer support activities were setting policies and guidelines providing internal education, offering incentives for use, and establishing disincentives for non-use.

Types of Employer Support Activities

Incentive Programs

Most of the incentive programs described in communities who had them were generally simple and straightforward. Program techniques ranged from observing employees as they entered the parking lot, to a lottery of self-proclaimed safety belt users, to signatures on buckle-up pledges. Incentives included savings bonds, prizes donated by local merchants, certificates, and free lunches. Employers involved included electric companies, a paint manufacturing company, and a car manufacturer.

Disincentives

In nearly all the case study communities, several private corporation employers used disincentives to belt non-use. Those included threats, such as "disciplinary action," assignment to a review board, or termination of employment. The disincentives were generally communicated in tandem with the belt use policy and usually had been in force as long as the policy itself. However, actual enforcement procedures were seldom explicitly stated.

For government employers, disincentives for not wearing a safety belt usually manifested themselves in the form of a statement in the agency's written belt use policy promising disciplinary action. No specific tracking of the enforcement of the disincentives was reported. Government employer disincentives went further than public sector policies. Government policies included threats of disciplinary action, assignment to a review board, or termination of employment. Enforcement policies were vague for both government and private corporate employers.

Belt Use Policy

In most communities, there were government and private employers that required employees to wear a safety belt when operating company cars. That policy most often was written; rarely was it simply a verbal edict. The policy usually was communicated to employees through the employee manual, sometimes through a fleet operations booklet and periodically through memos, often precipitated by an accident involving the particular organization in some way. Some employers had policies since the 1960's or 1970's; others had only recently made safety belt wearing a requirement for car use.

Internal Education

Various methods of educating employees to the importance of safety belt benefits were used by government and private employers in most of the case study communities. Those methods included films, the "convincer," seminars, signs in the parking lots, stickers, posters, newsletters, memos, paycheck stuffers, and employee driving courses. Only in the case of the employee driving course did a particular method appear associated with high belt use.

A number of these activities were essentially "one-time" events such as films, the convincer, seminars, and driving courses. Others such as signs, stickers, and posters depended on the employee passing in the right place at the right time in order to be exposed to their message. Others such as newsletters, memos and paycheck stuffers were delivered periodically and directly to the employee. Some activities had been going on for years, while others were more recent additions or inclusions of updated material in an established format.

Analysis of Employer Support Activities

Of the eight basic employer support activities, five were performed in most communities, two were conducted in about half the communities, and one was done by only a few communities. Table 2-17 gives participation for employer support and Table 2-18 shows the relative exposure of the activities to high and low use communities. Responses from 14 private sector employers (seven from high use communities, seven from low use) and 14 public sector employers (seven high use, seven low use), were analyzed by comparing high use communities to low use communities in terms of participation in each activity, key activity descriptors, audience size, frequency and time frame. There were no significant differences between the high use and low use communities in terms of the set of activities chosen or how frequently or how many years the activities had been conducted. There was one significant difference in terms of the content of the internal education efforts: employee driving courses were included by significantly more employers in high use than in low use communities. This will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

Besides the discovery of that one difference, it was found that organizations most likely to be engaged in safety belt promotion have some common characteristics whether found in high use or low use communities. Those characteristics included:

- having a substantial number of employees driving as part of their job,
- being a large organization with substantial resources,
- often having specific safety managers, or
- having centrally organized administration rather than a network of fairly autonomous departments.

These characteristics could have emerged due to the methods used in selecting employers for interviews, that is, a focus on the largest employers.

Table 2-17

PARTICIPATION IN EMPLOYER SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

	Higher Belt Use Communities				Lower Belt Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Policies and Guidelines								
- Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
- Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Internal Education								
- Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
- Government	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Incentives for Use								
- Corporate			x		x	x	x	x
- Government			x					
Disincentives for Non-Use								
- Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
- Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Table 2-18

EMPLOYER ACTIVITIES SUPPORTING SAFETY BELT USE

Activity	Relative Usage by Employer Type	
	Corporate	Government
Policies and Guidelines	***	***
Internal Education	***	***
Incentives for Use	**	*
Disincentives for Non-Use	***	**

Key:

- *** Activities performed in most communities
- ** Activities performed in about 1/2 of communities
- * Activities performed in few communities
- [blank] Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

ENFORCEMENT

Enforcement efforts were examined for an array of activities and measures. The full list of activities appears in Table 2-19. Activities such as departmental belt use policy, belt non-use disincentives, and incentive programs for officers to wear safety belts are similar to those covered in the Employer Support Section. The enforcement and adjudication activities listed in Table 2-19 are described below. Enforcement activities such as safety belt violation citations and written warnings were examined mostly for state and city agencies. County agencies, where they existed, were examined and discovered not to affect significantly the outcome of this section. Of the remaining enforcement activities, safety belt convictions per capita and conviction rates were significantly different between higher and lower use communities and will be discussed in the next chapter. Also, driving courses for police officers will be discussed in the next chapter. This activity showed a significant difference between lower and higher communities.

Table 2-19

POTENTIAL ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES EXAMINED FOR THE STUDY OF
PROGRAM FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SAFETY BELT USE

Community Outreach
Officer Education Efforts
Departmental Belt Use Policy
Departmental Belt Non-Use Disincentives
Incentive Programs for Officers to Wear Safety Belts
Belt-Use Status on Accident Reports
Written Warnings
Safety Belt Citations
Percentage of Traffic Citations Issued for Safety Belt Violations
Percentage of Total Officers Giving Safety Belt Citations
Per Capita Safety Belt Violations
Per Capita Safety Belt Convictions
Per Capita Moving Violations
Conviction Rates on Safety Belt Citations

Types of Enforcement Activities Observed

Community Outreach

Community outreach mainly consisted of officers making presentations at schools and other public meeting places. Safety belts were often integrated into presentations with topics of child seats, child safety, drinking and driving, and elderly persons driving. Some enforcement agencies, especially state police division offices, had an officer assigned solely to safety who gave presentations and coordinated other officers' presentations which included safety belts.

Officer Education Efforts

Officer education consisted of presentations to officers in training on the benefits of safety belt wearing for themselves and the public. Both officers in training and present officers received briefings on the enforcement and implementation of laws that made safety belts mandatory.

Belt Use Status on Accident Reports

Some police departments recorded belt use status on all departmental accident reports and some did not. Some had a formal procedure for releases of that information for each accident. A few were even aggressive in encouraging news reporters to include belt use status in their accident accounts.

The description of belt use status on accident reports varied tremendously in the eight sites. Besides clarity and simplicity of accident report forms, the uniformity of forms throughout the various enforcement agencies increased news reporters' successes in collecting safety belt status information. Having an obvious place on an accident report to find belt wearing status greatly increased a reporter's propensity to seek the status than did accident reports requiring in-depth analysis. Also, enforcement agencies that promoted reporting of belt status by the media were more readily received by reporters when the reports or reporting officers mentioned the lives saved and injuries reduced due to safety belts.

Safety Belt Citations

As the structure of the study indicated, four of the communities studied had primary enforcement laws, and four had secondary enforcement laws. Primary enforcement means a law officer can stop a motorist solely because the motorist or passenger was not wearing a safety belt. Secondary enforcement means the officer has to stop the motorist for some violation other than safety belt non-use and then cite the driver or passenger for not wearing a safety belt. In some cases, the officer could waive the primary offense and only cite the car occupant for secondary violations including safety belt violations. Only one community of the four with primary enforcement did actually cite safety belt violations as a primary offense. It should be noted that this community had the highest level of safety belt use and the highest increase in safety belt usage of the communities studied.

Some officers expressed hesitation over issuing safety belt citations due to procedural red tape. In some states, mostly secondary enforcement states, officers must cite each violation on a separate ticket. Officers were reluctant to hand a motorist multiple tickets. Many states were phasing out this multiple forms procedure for citing motorists.

Written Warnings

Written warnings are admonishments without fines. Written warnings have the advantage that they can be counted while verbal warnings cannot. In most communities, written warnings were relatively small in number in comparison to safety belt citations. Many of the agencies that gave written warnings were in the process of discontinuing this practice.

Percentage of Traffic Citations Issued for Safety Belt Violations

The percentage of traffic citations issued for safety belt violations was meant to show how much emphasis a department placed on safety belt violators. This activity is discussed further in Chapter 3.

Percentage of Total Officers Giving Safety Belt Citations

This measure showed the difference between enforcement agencies that had traffic patrols and those that did not. Agencies with traffic patrols usually had fewer than 50 percent of their officers writing safety belt citations while agencies without traffic patrols claimed nearly 100 percent of their officers

could give safety belt citations. Exceptions to these findings were state enforcement agencies that worked solely on traffic problems and did not provide full service criminal investigations.

Per Capita Safety Belt Violations and Per Capita Moving Violations

The per capita measures indicated the likelihood of an individual receiving a citation from police officers. The per capita safety belt violations showed how many people were ticketed for safety belts while the per capita moving violations showed the maximum number of people officers could reach ticketed for all traffic offenses. Per capita measures included violations from state and city agencies. In cases where county agencies existed within the eight community sample, they did not usually perform substantial traffic enforcement functions. These measures are discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

Analysis

Of the seven basic enforcement activities, most state agencies did five, and some state agencies did one. Table 2-20 gives the participation in enforcement activities for state and local agencies while Table 2-21 shows the exposure of the activities in the high and low use communities. Many measures for state and local activities mentioned in Table 2-19 were also examined in this study. The citation rates for safety belt violations showed a statistical difference between higher and lower belt use communities. The rankings per capita convictions of safety belt violations almost perfectly matched the rankings of communities ordered by increasing usage. More analysis of safety belt conviction rates and per capita convictions will be discussed in Chapter 3.

RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF USE OF ACTIVITIES

Participation in activities for the eight communities varied by activity. For some activities, some person or organization in almost all communities had tried that activity. Other activities did not exhibit as much exposure in the different communities. The exposure and participation of different activities depended on the extent to which the activity was institutionalized, satisfaction gained for those involved the activity's popularity, money available, and many other factors. A discussion of the definitions of frequency of participation follows. Tables 2-22, 2-23, and 2-24 show the different frequencies of participation and also indicates community by community patterns.

Activities Performed in Most Communities

A number of particular activities conducted to promote safety belt use were found in most communities. We found those activities in both the higher and lower belt use communities and therefore concluded that participation in these activities does not help to explain why belt use is higher in some communities and lower in others. Table 2-22 shows which activities were in this category and which communities participated in each activity. For this discussion, "activities everyone does" are defined as those activities which were reported by at least one contact person in seven or eight of the eight case study communities. Most media and employer support activities, some enforcement activities, and one community support activities are among them.

Table 2-20

PARTICIPATION IN ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

	Higher Belt Use Communities				Lower Belt Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Community Outreach								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
-- State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Departmental Belt- Use Policy								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x	NA	NA	x	
-- State Police	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Departmental Belt Non-Use Policy								
Discincentives								
-- Local Police	x	x	NA	x	NA	NA	x	
-- State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Incentives and Internal Education for Officers								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x	NA	x		x
-- State Police	NA	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Written Warnings								
-- Local Police		x						
-- State Police		x	x			x	x	
Primary Citations								
-- Local Police	x							
-- State Police								
Secondary Citations								
-- Local Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
-- State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

NA - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Table 2-21

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

Activities	Relative Usage	
	Local Police	State Police
Community Outreach	***	***
Departmental Belt Use Policy	**	***
Departmental Belt Non-Use Policy Disincentives	**	***
Incentives and Internal Education for Officers	**	***
Written Warnings	*	**
Primary Citations	*	
Secondary Citations	***	***

Key:

- *** Activities performed in most communities
- ** Activities performed in about half of the communities
- * Activities performed in a few communities
- [blank] Activities not performed

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Table 2-22

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY MOST CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

	Participating Communities							
	Higher Use Communities				Lower Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
<u>Media</u>								
PSAs - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
PSAs - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
News Stories - Newspaper	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
News Stories - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
News Stories - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	na	x	x
Accident Accounts - Newspaper	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Accident Accounts - Radio	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Accident Accounts - T.V.	x	x	x	x	x	x	na	x
Talk Shows - Radio	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
<u>Community Support</u>								
Media Appearances	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<u>Employer Support</u>								
Belt Use Policy - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Belt Use Policy - Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Internal Education - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Internal Education - Government	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Disincentives - Corporate	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<u>Enforcement</u>								
Community Outreach - State Police	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
- Local Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Belt Use Policy - State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Internal Education - State Police	na	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Disincentives - State Police	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Issuing Secondary Citations	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

na - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Table 2-23

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY ABOUT HALF THE CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

	Participating Communities							
	Higher Use Communities				Lower Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
<u>Media</u>								
PSAs - Newspapers			x			x		x
Paid Ads - Radio	x	x	x	x			x	
- T.V.	x	x	x					x
Talk Shows - T.V.	x	x						x
<u>Community Support</u>								
Distribution of Materials	x		x	x	x		x	x
Directives	x		x		x			x
Local Coalition Memberships			x				x	x
Lobbying	x		x	x	x	x		
Seminar Attendance			x	x	x		x	x
<u>Employer Support</u>								
Incentive Programs - Corporate				x	x	x	x	x
Disincentive - Government	x	x	x	x	x		x	
<u>PI&E</u>								
Billboards, Signs	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	
Brochures, Posters	x	na	x	x		na	x	x
Gimmicks	x	na	x			na	x	x
Classroom Presentations	x	na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Community Displays/ Demonstrations		na	x	x	x	na	x	x
Driver's Manual	x	na	x	x		na	x	x
Envelope Stuffers	x	na	x			na	x	x
Films	x	na	x	x		na	x	
Newsletters	x	na	x			na	x	x
<u>Enforcement</u>								
Belt Use Policy - Local Police	x	x	x	x		na	na	x
Disincentives - Local Police	x	na	x	x		na	na	x
Incentives and Internal Education - local Police	x	x	x	x		na	x	x
Written Warnings - State Police		x	x				x	x

na - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Table 2-24

ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY FEW CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

	Participating Communities							
	Higher Use Communities				Lower Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
<u>Media</u>								
Paid Ads - Newspaper								x
<u>Community Support</u>								
"Saved by the Belt" Testimonials				x				x
<u>Employer Support</u>								
Incentive Programs -- Government				x				
<u>Enforcement</u>								
Issuing Primary Citations - Local Police					x			
Written Warnings - Local Police								x

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

The use of these activities appears unrelated to variations in belt use because nearly all the communities studied, both those with higher use and those with lower use, did them. This might have been because they were necessary precursors to community acceptance and law enforcement, because they were easy to do, because they had always been done, because these activities came highly recommended, because the providers got satisfaction from doing them, or for some other reason. At any rate, by virtue of their popularity, these were the activities most likely to continue to be done whether or not they appear to increase belt use.

Activities Conducted in About Half the Communities

A number of other safety belt promotion activities in all five categories -- media, community support, employer support, PI&E, and enforcement and adjudication -- were conducted in about half the communities. Table 2-23 lists those activities and shows which communities participated in each activity. This category included those activities reported in three to six of the eight case study communities. The use of these activities seemed unrelated to higher or lower belt use, with the following possible exceptions:

- media: paid ads on radio or TV,
- employer support: governmental disincentive programs
- PI&E: films, and
- enforcement: local police activities regarding belt use policies, disincentives, and incentives and internal education.

This study showed measurable statistical differences between higher and lower belt use communities in terms of the paid ads but not for the other activities; more detailed research should be conducted into the effects of the other activities above. Otherwise, the remaining activities are not likely to be either completely entrenched or effortless, and are thus candidates for possible discontinuance should an evaluation show them not to be significantly associated with increased belt usage.

Activities Used in Few Communities

Some activities used to promote safety belt use were conducted in only a few communities. This infrequent usage did not permit making significant distinctions between high and low use communities. Table 2-24 illustrates the activities in this category and the number of communities reporting their usage. For this discussion, "activities performed in few communities" were defined as those activities which were reported by a contact person in only one or two of the eight communities. At least one activity from each of the five categories of activities was among them.

The choice of these activities seems unrelated to higher or lower belt use -- but with so few communities currently reporting their use, comparisons were difficult.

3

ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH HIGHER BELT USE

Out of the many community activities intended to promote increased safety belt usage examined during this study, three activities distinguished communities reporting higher proportions of the population wearing safety belts from communities reporting lower proportions using safety belts: tailoring and targeting messages to specific audiences, maximizing market penetration, and enforcing belt use laws. While the information gathered here does not specifically prove that adoption of these activities in a community will automatically lead to higher belt use, the combination of their statistical significance and their intuitive appeal would suggest that localities desirous of increasing local belt usage consider undertaking these activities, if possible.

PROVIDING MESSAGES FOR SPECIFIC AUDIENCES

The community's ability and/or willingness to distinguish and target specific audiences or to tailor programs to sub-groups identified within an audience may explain some of the difference in belt usage rates between high use and low use communities. Alternatively, it may simply be an indicator of a thoughtful and effective program. In either case, it may be a strategy worth considering at the local level.

Tailoring

Higher belt use communities more often tailored their media programs to fit the demographic influences of language, literacy rates, and special audiences than did lower use communities. Examples of tailoring were found in one of the higher use communities that had educational levels below state and national levels. They emphasized activities using television rather than activities using newspapers. This community program had concentrated on what it perceived its population could best absorb, the visual medium of television. Another example of tailoring was in the higher use community with a large hispanic population. The program coordinator distributed PSAs and press releases, some in Spanish, some in English, to media providers with large hispanic audiences, while the lower use community with a large Hispanic population was not able to identify and target the media providers reaching that specific subgroup to provide appropriate materials.

Targeting

Higher use communities reached larger proportions of a particular targeted audience -- employees -- than did lower use communities. In the higher use communities, employees who drove as part of their job were also more specifically targeted. Higher use communities reached larger proportions of this subgroup with each of the eight employer support activities:

- Films
- The "Convincer"
- Seminars
- Signs in Parking Lots
- Stickers, Posters
- Newsletters, Memos
- Paycheck Stuffers
- Employee Driving Courses.

The audience size of each activity was measured by the following proportion using employer estimates and 1984 census data: the number of employees divided by the number of persons in the community's labor force.

Table 3-1 shows via visual inspection a noticeable difference between organizations in higher and lower use communities in the number of driver training courses that offer safety belt curricula. In order for the difference between higher and lower use communities to have appeared, the higher use communities must have done a better job of targeting companies, government and enforcement agencies, and motivating them to maintain the driving courses with safety belt curricula than did the low use communities. The companies usually had to be prompted to implement driver safety courses with safety belt instruction. In several instances, presentations from program coordinators or police officers were more readily received after there were accidents which affected the firm.

MAXIMIZING MARKET PENETRATION

The proportion of the media market reached by particular activities -- PSAs, paid ads, news stories, safety belt status in accident accounts, and radio and television talk shows -- explained some of the difference in belt usage rates between higher and lower use communities.

Analysis

The audience size of each activity was measured by the following proportion using numbers collected and summarized by time slot by Arbitron, Inc. during the summer and fall of 1986:

- the number of people over 18 (or number of households) reading/listening/viewing (Table 2-2), and
- the total number of people over 18 (or number of households) in the same geographic area (Table 2-3).

The proportions found in higher use communities were then statistically compared to the proportions found in lower use communities using a differences of proportions test.

Table 3-1: DRIVING COURSES FOR CORPORATE AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYERS AND ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

	Higher Belt Use Communities			Lower Belt Use Communities		
	Corporations	Government	Police Agencies	Corporations	Government	Police Agencies
Organizations with Driving Courses Including Safety Belt Curriculum	3	5	4	0	1	1
Organizations with Education and Internal Promotion Activities	5	7	4	3	6	4
Total Organizations Contacted for Employer Support Activities	6	7	8	3	7	5

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Findings

For the 14 media activities examined (see Table 3-2), the statistical analysis showed the higher use communities reached larger media market shares even though the population sizes of the two groups are very close. The exception was reports of belt usage in newspaper accident accounts. Thus, in the higher use communities, more or possibly higher volume stations and papers were conducting media activities in support of safety belt use than in lower use communities.

Table 3-2

MEDIA ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SAFETY BELT USAGE

<u>Newspapers:</u>	<u>TV Stations:</u>	<u>Radio Stations:</u>
PSAs	PSAs	PSAs
Paid Ads	Paid Ads	Paid Ads
News Stories	News Stories	News Stories
Accident Accounts	Accident Accounts	Accident Accounts
	Talk Shows	Talk Shows

The weighted averages for audiences reached¹ by television and radio showed more penetration of audiences in high use communities than in low use communities. Average audience estimates for times most likely to contain each activity were compared to the total number of households per persons in the media markets which covered each of the communities studied. The results of the comparisons, using data from Tables 2-2 and Table 2-3, were the percentages of markets reached in Table 3-3. Significant differences between the higher and lower use communities were observed using the differences of proportions test.

Implications

Effective strategies to stimulate increased belt use could include working with media providers to increase the market penetration of safety belt information. This will be easier in certain communities than in others due to differences in media market structures.

Media Providers

Various providers reach different audience sizes and those sizes may vary depending on the time of day. Traditionally, the late evening news half-hour attracts large audiences. News stories and belt status accident accounts are the activities suited to those time frames. PSAs often play in late night

¹The average of the proportion of the possible audiences reached in each of the high and low communities was weighted by each community's population for the purpose of more accurately comparing the higher and lower use groups.

Table 3-3: MEDIA ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SAFETY BELT USAGE

(Percentages of Audiences Reached in Each Community)

	Higher Belt Use Communities						Lower Use Use Communities					
	A	B	C	D	Average Percentage Reached	Weighted Average Percentage Reached ¹	A	B	C	D	Average Percentage Reached	Weighted Average Percentage Reached
T.V. Stations												
PSAs	11.8%	27.6%	13.8%	NA	17.7%	18.4%	18.8%	NA	29.5%	17.3%	21.9%	19.1%
Paid Ads	14.8	2.0	5.9	NA	7.6	5.8	0	NA	0	6.7	1.7	0.4
News Stories	44.4	21.6	17.7	NA	27.9	22.9	13.8	NA	25.6	17.4	18.9	14.2
Accident Accounts	50.3	21.6	2.6	NA	31.2	25.7	24.7	NA	30.3	17.4	27.1	25.7
Talk Shows	1.0	22.7	0	NA	7.9	6.1	0	NA	0	12.5	4.2	0.8
Radio Stations												
PSAs	6.0%	9.0%	6.1%	NA	7.0%	7.9%	2.3%	3.6%	4.3%	3.7%	3.6%	3.6%
Paid Ads	24.0	8.9	5.0	NA	12.6	7.0	0	0	6.9	0	1.7	1.5
News Stories	2.9	8.8	2.7	NA	5.6	6.7	3.4	3.4	7.2	4.5	5.4	6.0
Accident Accounts	3.8	8.8	3.3	NA	5.3	7.2	6.0	6.0	7.2	4.5	5.3	4.8
Talk Shows	2.4	8.8	3.2	NA	4.8	6.6	1.1	1.1	7.0	10.8	5.6	2.4

¹Percentages weighted by population in each community.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

time slots and other time slots that have traditionally small audiences. Radio talk shows and paid ads are more likely to air during the average viewing/listening time from 7 p.m. to midnight. That audience is larger than late night viewers and smaller than the news slot. TV talk shows appear at all hours. Efforts should be made to encourage providers to conduct safety belt activities at times that best fit the station or paper format and maximize audience exposure. A balance should be sought between the number of providers likely to conduct safety belt activities and the number of people each particular provider is likely to reach with particular activities.

Media Market Structure

Because media market structures effect the exposure of safety belt information, it is important to understand how media market structures vary. Some communities tend to have clearly defined markets while others do not. There are two types of defined media markets. In one, the community is clearly the nucleus of the media market and is large enough to maintain national network affiliates. That type of community has national affiliate television and radio stations and a major newspaper. Also, it probably has a population of at least 90,000. In the other type of clearly defined media market, the community is one of a cluster of similar-sized communities that total over 90,000 in population. In either the city of 90,000 plus or the cluster of cities, a media market is clearly defined if the audience is solely and sufficiently served by the media providers in that area. These situations can be considered instances of a clearly defined media market.

A poorly defined media market is often the result of the overshadowing effects of a much larger city. In some instances, the community of interest may be in what is considered the hinterlands beyond the suburbs of the major city. It may receive television and radio from the major city with little opportunity for input on concerns specific to that community (such as safety belts). In the other instances, a large city media may intrude substantially into the locally established media market with competing national affiliate or cable programming. In either case, the number of stations needed to reach the local audience is greater than in a community of a clearly defined media market.

ENFORCING SAFETY BELT LAWS

Increasing enforcement levels might be another strategy for increasing belt usage in communities. The differences in per capita per month safety belt citations and conviction rates helped explain some of the differences in belt usage rates.

Measures of Enforcement

Convictions Per Capita

Convictions per capita per month (see Table 3-4) showed the likelihood of receiving a safety belt citation and being convicted of that violation in a particular community. Convictions included all safety belt violations for which the fine was paid (whether or not the citation was contested). Convictions per capita showed how actively law officers carried out the enforcement of safety belt laws. For this analysis, the rankings of per capita convictions were compared to the rankings of communities by the amount of increase in safety belt usage, and a strong correlation was found ($r = .65$).

Table 3-4

CONVICTIONS FOR SAFETY BELT VIOLATIONS PER CAPITA

Community	Safety Belt Use Increase	Per Capita Per Month Conviction Rate
A	52.5%	.0057104
D	27.1%	.0055790
H	25.9%	.004406
C	23.5%	.00047952
G	23.1%	.0001487
B	22.3%	.0002156
E	10%	N.A.
F	N.a.	N.A.

N.A. - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Conviction Rates

Conviction rates for safety belt violations were the number of safety belt citations for which the fine was paid divided by the total number of safety belt citations. The conviction rates in Table 3-5 came from exact data, statistical models, and estimates given by both city and State Police. Conviction rates reflected the strength of the law and the support of the law by the local judiciary.

Safety Belt Citations

Safety belt citations were calculated as a percent of all moving traffic violations issued. As shown in Table 3-5, the higher belt use group of communities had much higher percentages of safety belt citations than the lower use group.

Table 3-5

ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AND BELT USE STATISTICS

	Higher Belt Use Communities				Lower Belt Use Communities			
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Conviction Rate	90%	90%	95%	85%	NA ³	80%	67%	75%
Safety Belt Citations as a Percentage of Moving Violations	27.5%	1.6%	10.3%	22.6%	NA ³	1.1%	1.4%	7.2%
Percent of Drivers Wearing Safety Belts ¹	66%	72%	55%	55%	19%	30%	36%	46%
Improvement in Belt Usage Rate by Absolute Percent ²	52.5%	22.3%	23.5%	27.1%	10%	NA ³	23.1%	25.9%

¹Most recent data available at each site; some observations were as recent as July, 1987.

²Over the time period spanning just before the enactment of each belt use law to the most recent data available.

³NA - Data were not available.

Source: Tabulations by Ecosometrics, Incorporated.

Overall Data Availability

Tables 3-4 and 3-5 show how that communities in the lower belt use group were less likely to be able to provide specific data to the research team concerning enforcement activities than the higher use group. This lack of ability reflected both a lower level of organization for safety belt activities, and concomitantly, a lower level of priority assigned to safety belt issues.

Analysis

Convictions per capita and conviction rates showed statistically significant relationships to safety belt usage rates. First, rankings of per capita safety belt convictions matched almost exactly the rankings of increases of

safety belt usage in each of the communities as shown in Table 3-4. Thus, the community with the highest per capita per month number of convictions had the largest increase in safety belt usage. Second, conviction rates were associated with the groups of communities when the rates were tested against higher and lower belt use groups. The safety belt citations as a percent of all moving violations also clearly separated higher and lower belt use communities.

These measures give a simple message: police need to give safety belt citations and judges need to uphold the citations. Communities with higher per capita safety belt convictions had proportionally higher increases in their safety belt usage. The community with the highest belt use increase (52.5%) had a per capita per month conviction rate of .0057104, which is 26 times the per capita per month conviction rate of the community with the lowest belt use increase (22.3%). As shown in Table 3-5, the communities in the higher belt use group had conviction rates ranging from 85 percent to 95 percent while the communities in the lower belt use group had conviction rates ranging from 67 percent to 80 percent.

Officials in two of the communities with lower conviction rates stressed how they wanted to improve the adjudication process. Program directors and coalition members both wanted to encourage judges and others involved in the adjudication to get involved with and informed on safety belt benefits. Enforcement officials also noted that officers did not like to write tickets that did not receive convictions, because conviction rates sometimes reflected on an officer's record. Also, citations often resulted in citizen complaints which caused officers to hesitate in giving citations. Enforcement officials need the backing of judges for motivation and encouragement in the enforcement of the law.

APPENDIX A

SAFETY BELT PROGRAM ACTIVITIES REPORTED AT THE STATE LEVEL

SAFETY BELT PROGRAM ACTIVITIES REPORTED AT THE STATE LEVEL

INTRODUCTION

Methodology

The methodology employed to identify program activities used at the state level to enhance the implementation of safety belt use laws included the following steps:

1. Examining existing documentation in NHTSA's Office of Occupant Protection (including state implementation plans and monitoring protocol forms).
2. Preparing a roster of state safety belt coordinators in states with belt use laws, using NHTSA documents.
3. Being introduced by NHTSA's Office of Driver and Pedestrian Research to the Regional Offices by means of a letter and brief project description
4. Making contact with state safety belt coordinators by phone:
 - to request written materials on their programs,
 - to have them confirm or correct information recorded from NHTSA documents, and
 - to have them identify types or broad categories of approaches they were using or had used to implement their belt use law either before or after its passage. There was little or no discussion of the scope of any particular activity.
5. Documenting information extracted from phone conversations, from material sent by state program coordinators and from materials examined at NHTSA's Office of Occupant Protection.
6. Preparing a matrix of which belt use law implementation approaches were reported by which states.
7. Preparing appendix entries which describe each state's programs individually in terms of approaches.
8. Preparing summary tables of "core" program activities in categories of common approaches by state.

9. Sending each state a copy of their individual appendix entry for review.
10. Preparing a report which identified core program activities and common approaches, and
11. Revising the report based on NHTSA review.

Purpose of This Appendix

This appendix identifies, but does not analyze, core program factors common to the majority of state programs and activities. It is a compilation, not a comparison, of information gathered from a number of sources. It is intended to report, not interpret, information provided by state program coordinators. It is intended to describe safety belt law implementation efforts generically but not in terms of specific projects. It is intended to parallel, not to supersede, information collected and reported by the NHTSA Office of Occupant Protection from the regional offices. It is intended to describe efforts such as enforcement, penalties and adjudication as implementation activities rather than as elements of the laws.

As one reads through this appendix, several points should be remembered:

- In documenting our brief phone conversations with state safety belt coordinators, program activities and approaches mentioned were recorded into approximately 80 specific categories without note as to the scope or frequency of the activity.
- If particular categories of approaches were not recorded for a particular state, it may be that they did not come up in conversation or that that state actually does not use an approach in that category, but no systematic attempts were made to distinguish between the two possibilities.
- All information was gathered from the state program coordinator's perspective.
- Complete information on each state's approaches to various "core" program factors and activities was not pursued.
- The state program coordinators reported only the funding for implementation of their belt use law (i.e., they separated out the costs of implementing their child restraint law wherever possible, although it often was not possible).
- The elements of the law itself were not examined, but rather the implementation of the law was the subject of the examination.

The Laws Requiring Safety Belt Use

Twenty-six states and the District of Columbia have passed safety belt use laws. New York's was first in July, 1984 and Florida's, on June 2, 1986, was the most recent to be included in this analysis. Fines ranged from no fine to \$50 maximum. Some laws became effective upon signature by the Governor

while others included effective dates as much as 28 months after the Governor's signature. Table A-1 shows the specifics of each belt use law. Of the 26 states and the District of Columbia,¹ 25 laws were effective as of August 1, 1986. Of those 25, 18 currently carry a fine. All, except Minnesota, include provisions in their laws which provide for a fine by July 1, 1987.

The Program Factors

State program administrators generally discussed their program implementation in terms of five "core factors":

1. generating community support,
2. public information and education,
3. employer support (private sector and government agency),
4. enforcement, and
5. adjudication.

This appendix includes separate discussions with summary tables for each of the five program factors. The summary tables identify the various approaches to program implementation used by the 26 states and the District of Columbia having mandatory use laws.

These summary tables were structured so that if a state was using a particular approach, it was indicated, but if a particular approach was not indicated, it may simply have been because it did not come up in the discussion.

As a second part of this effort, detailed summaries of activities by each state were prepared. Each state summary included:

- contact person (state safety belt coordinators),
- region and population total,
- specifics about the law,
- FY86 funding for state implementation,
- community support,
- public information and education efforts,
- employer support,
- enforcement, and
- adjudication.

These summaries are available upon request.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Implementation efforts during the early "post passage" phase were aimed at retaining current confirmed belt users, establishing belt use habits in those not yet licensed to drive, increasing belt usage by occasional belt users, and possibly converting a few non-users. The expression of community support created an atmosphere in which "belt use" was seen as "the thing to do". Because implementation efforts were aimed at the four distinct populations

¹Since the tables were prepared, the laws in Massachusetts and Nebraska were rescinded.

Table A-1

SPECIFICS OF EACH SAFETY BELT LAW BY STATE

	Law Enacted	Law Effective	Fine Effective	Enforcement Type	Fine for Non-Use
California	10/01/85	01/01/86	01/01/86	secondary	\$20/\$50
Connecticut	06/27/85	01/01/86	02/01/86	primary	15.00
District of Columbia	10/22/85	12/12/85	06/12/86	secondary	15.00
Florida	06/02/86	07/01/86	01/01/87	secondary	20.00
Hawaii	06/05/85	12/16/85	12/16/85	primary	15.00
Idaho	04/04/86	07/01/86	07/01/86	secondary	5.00
Illinois	01/08/85	07/01/85	07/01/85	primary	25.00
Indiana	04/17/85	07/01/87	07/01/87	secondary	25.00
Iowa	02/20/86	07/01/86	01/01/87	primary	10.00
Kansas	05/01/86	07/01/86	07/01/87	secondary	10.00
Louisiana	07/10/85	07/01/86	08/01/86	secondary	25.00
Maryland	05/13/86	01/01/86	08/01/86	secondary	25.00
Massachusetts	10/22/85	01/01/86	01/01/86	secondary	15.00
Michigan	03/08/85	07/01/85	07/01/85	secondary	25.00
Minnesota	02/24/86	08/01/86		secondary	0
Missouri	03/05/85	09/28/85	07/01/87	secondary	10.00
Nebraska	06/05/85	09/06/85	09/06/85	secondary	25.00
New Jersey	11/08/84	03/01/85	03/01/85	secondary	20.00
New Mexico	04/02/85	01/01/86	01/01/86	primary	25-50
New York	07/12/84	12/01/84	01/01/85	primary	0-50
North Carolina	05/23/85	10/01/85	01/01/87	secondary	25.00
Ohio	02/04/86	05/06/86	07/04/86	secondary	20.00
Oklahoma	06/04/85	02/01/87	02/01/87	secondary	25.00
Tennessee	04/21/86	04/21/86	01/01/87	secondary	20-50
Texas	06/16/85	09/01/85	12/01/85	primary	25-50
Utah	03/18/86	04/28/86	04/28/86	secondary	10.00
Washington	03/31/86	06/11/86	01/01/87	secondary	25-45

described above, community support was welcomed from a variety of community workers and leaders. The following types of community support activities, shown in Table A-2, were identified:

- media appearances,
- directives/internal communications,
- coalition membership,
- lobbying,
- attending seminars/training workshops,
- distributing material to the public,
- providing a role model (e.g., "saved by the belt"), and
- making donations.

The following community workers and leaders, also shown in Table A-2, were identified as providers of that support:

- political leaders,
- entertainment/sports figures,
- news reporters,
- public interest groups,
- churches,
- auto clubs,
- local service clubs,
- chamber of commerce,
- insurance companies,
- driver education instructors,
- auto sales and services personnel,
- cab drivers,
- rental car personnel, or
- the medical community.

In discussions with state program administrators, a number of issues surfaced which were useful in determining the relative importance of various dimensions such as:

- the type of community support,
- the type of person giving community support,
- the synergy between the type of support and the type of person giving it,
- the timing of that support relative to passage of the law, effective date, enforcement efforts and other community implementation efforts,
- the coordination of that support with the four other "core" program factors,
- the audiences reached and impacted by the support, and
- the resources required to generate that support.

Table A-2: COMMUNITY SUPPORT

STATE	POLITICAL LEADERS	ENTERTAINMENT/ SPORTS FIGURES	NEWS REPORTERS	PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS	CHURCHES	AUTO CLUBS	LOCAL SERVICE CLUBS
California	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b,c,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Connecticut				a,f	f	b,f	b,f
District of Columbia	a,c,d,f,g	a,c	f	b,c,d,e,f	b,c,d,e,f	a,b,c,d,e,f	b,c,e,f
Florida	d,e		b,f	c,e,f		a	b
Hawaii	a		b,f	d		b	
Idaho				a,c,d,f	b,f	f	f
Illinois	c,d	a		a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Indiana	a,b	a		b,e,f	b	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	
Iowa	a,b,c,d,f,g	a,f,g	a,c,h	a,e,f		a,b,c,d,e,f	b,c,e,h
Kansas	a,b,d,e,f	a,b,f,g	a,b,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,e,f,g,h	d,f,g	a,e,f,h	a,e,f
Louisiana	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,b,e,f			a,b,c,d,e,f	
Maryland	a,b,d,e,f,g	a,d,e,g	a,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,b,c,d,e,f,g	
Massachusetts	a,b,d,e,f,g,h	a,c,f,g		a,b,d,f		a,b,c,d,e,f,h	a,b,d,f,h
Michigan	a,b,c,d,f,g	a,g	a,b,c,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	b,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b,e,f,h
Minnesota	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a	a,b,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	e,f
Missouri	a,d,e,f	a,g	a,b,c,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,e,f,g
Nebraska	a,b,d,f,g,h	e,g	b,c,f,g			a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b
New Jersey	a,c,d,e,f		b,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b	b,c,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,e,f,g
New Mexico	a,b,c,d,e,g,h	a,g	a,b,c,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	c	a,b,c,d,e,f,h	c,e,g
New York	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,f,g,h	a,d,c,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	b,c,d,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b,e,f
North Carolina	a,b,c,d,e,g	a,b,d,e,f,g	e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,b,c,d,e,f,g	b,e,f,g,h
Ohio	a,b,d,e,f,g	a,c,f,g	a,c,e,f,g,h	c,d,e,f,g	c	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b,c,e,g
Oklahoma	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Tennessee	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a,b,d,f,g	a,b,d,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a,c,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Texas	a,c,d,e,f,g	a,e,g	a,c,e,g	a,b,c,e,f,g,h	a,f		a,b,c,e,f,g,h
Utah	a,b,c,d,f,g		b,f		b,e		b,c,h
Washington	a,b,c,d,e,f	a,b,d,e,f,g	a,b,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,b,c,d,e,f,g	b,f

KEY:

- a making a media appearance
- b giving a directive or communication to their constituent group
- c being a member of the state coalition
- d lobbying or testifying on behalf of the MJJ.

- e attending seminars or training workshops on belt use implementation
- f distributing material to the public
- g providing a specific role model of belt use
- h making a donation of other than their time

A-6

Table A-2 (continued)

STATE	NUMBER OF COMMERCE	INSURANCE COMPANIES	DRIVER EDUCATION INSTRUCTORS	AUTO SALES AND SERVICE PERSONNEL	CAB DRIVERS	RENTAL CAR PERSONNEL	MEDICAL COMMUNITY
California	a,b,c,d,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	b,c,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,h	f	c,e,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Connecticut	f	e,f,g	b,e	f		f	b,c,f
District of Columbia	b,c,d,e,f	a,b,c,d,e,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		e	e,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Florida		d,f	e	c		f	b,c,d,f
Hawaii	f	b,f	b'	b,f		b,f	a,c,d,f
Idaho	h		b	a,b,c,d			b,c,d,f
Illinois		b,f	a,b,c,e,f,g	f			a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Indiana	a,b,c,d,e,f	b,c	b,c,d,e,f	h	f		a,c,d,e,f
Iowa	a,b,f	a,b,c,e,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	c,d,f,h	g		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Kansas			a,b,e,f	h		b	a,b,d,e,f
Louisiana	b,e	a,b,c,d,e,f	b,d,e,f,g	a,d,e,f,h			a,b,c,d,e,f
Maryland	b,f	a,b,c,d,f,h	b,d,g	a,c,d,f,g,h			a,b,d,e,f,g
Massachusetts					f		a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Michigan		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,g	f,h			a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Minnesota	e,f	b,h	d,f	b,e,f,g,h		a,b,d,e,f,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Missouri	c,d,g	f	f,g	f	c		a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Nebraska	f		b,g			b,f	b,c,d,e,f,g
New Jersey	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f	a,b,e,g	b,c,d,f,g,h		b	a,b,c,d,e,f,g
New Mexico	a,b	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h		b,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
New York	c,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,e,g	a,b,c,e,f,h			a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
North Carolina	f	b,c,f	b,c,d,e,f,g	b,f,h		b,f	b,c,d,e,f
Ohio	c,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	c,d,e,h			a,b,c,d,e,f,g
Oklahoma		a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h		a,b,c,d,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Tennessee		b,c,f,g	b,c,f,g	b,c,d,e,f,g			a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Texas		a,b,c,e,f,g,h	b,c,e,f,g	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h			a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
Utah	c	c	b,c,f	a,c,d,e,f			b,c
Washington		a,c,d,f,g	a,b,d,e,f,g	a,c,d,f			a,b,c,d,e,f,g

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Public information and education (PI&E) campaigns were conducted to reach the four distinct populations previously described, the confirmed user, the future driver, the occasional user, and the confirmed non-user. Four basic content areas were being addressed:

1. elements of the law,
2. the importance of belt use,
3. "please buckle up", and
4. graphic descriptions, demonstrations or statistics.

Where possible, a mix of these four content areas was used to increase the effectiveness of the message on all four populations. In some cases, however, a specific media such as road signs or stickers limited the content to "please buckle up" messages. In others, the law itself was being challenged or did not yet carry a fine, and thus the elements of the law were seldom in a particular state's PI&E campaign.

Many of the PI&E activities were designed for the general public. Media with high initial costs which become more cost effective the more copies were produced were most likely to include material tailored to a general public. Those media included radio and TV PSAs, radio or TV news specials, sports events (e.g., a message on the scoreboard), spots shown before or after a feature at the movie theatre, road signs, newspaper articles, brochures, posters, videos and films, demonstrations and displays, billboards, a hotline or a statewide newsletter.

Some PI&E activities were used to target specific audiences. For instance, drivers might be targeted through the license or car registration process, when renting a car, when paying their insurance premiums or when buying a new car. New drivers were targeted through state drivers' manuals and driver education classes. Rehabilitating drivers were targeted through traffic school. Patients were targeted through their doctors' offices or through emergency rooms. School children were targeted directly through their classroom curriculum.

Table A-3 shows the various media used to reach the general public and Table A-4 shows the various media used to reach the specific targeted audiences in each state.

Discussions with state program administrators helped identify the relative importance of various dimensions, including

- the media used,
- the content used,
- the presentation,
- the audience targeted,
- the audiences reached,

Table A-3

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
GEARED TOWARD THE GENERAL PUBLIC

STATE	RADIO	TV	NEWS SPECIAL	SPORTS EVENTS	MOVIE SHORTS	SIGNS	NEWSPAPER ARTICLES
California	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	b,c	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c,d
Connecticut	b,d	b,d	b	c		c	
District of Columbia	a,c	a,c	a		c	c	a,b,c
Florida	a,b,c	b	b	a,c			
Hawaii	b,c	b	b	c			b,c
Idaho	a	a,b,c,d	b			c	a,b,c,d
Illinois	a,b,c	a,b,c		c		a,c	a,c
Indiana	b,c	a,b,c		c		c	a,b,c
Iowa	b	b	b			c	a,b
Kansas	a,b,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,d	b,c,d		a,c	a,b,c,d
Louisiana	a,b,c	b,c				c	a,b,c
Maryland	c	a,c	a,b,c,d	c	c	c	a,b,c,d
Massachusetts	b,c	a,b,c	a,b,c,d	c		c	a,b,c
Michigan	a,b,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c		c	a,b,c,d
Minnesota	a,b,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c	c	c	a,b,c,d
Missouri	a,b,c	a,b,c,d		c		c	a,b,c
Nebraska	a,b,c	a,b,c,d	a	c		c	a,b,c
New Jersey	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c			a,b,c,d
New Mexico	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,d		b,c,d	c,d	a,b,c,d
New York	a,b,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c		c	c,d
North Carolina	a,b	a,b	a,b	c		a	a,b
Ohio	a,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c		a,c	a,b,c,d
Oklahoma	b	b	a,b,c,d		a,b,c,d		a,b,c,d
Tennessee	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d				c	a,b,c,d
Texas	a,b,c	a,b,c,d		c	c	a,c	a,b,c,d
Utah	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d			c	a,b,d
Washington	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c		c	

KEY:

- a elements of the law
- b how belt works and why important
- c "Buckle-Up" request
- d physical demonstration of belt use effectiveness or statistics

Table A-3 (continued)

STATE	BROCHURES	POSTERS	VIDEOS/FILMS	DEMOS/DISPLAYS	BILLBOARDS	STATE NEWSLETTER	HOTLINE
California	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d
Connecticut	b,c			d			
District of Columbia	a,b,c	a,b,c	a,b,c	a,b,c,d	c		
Florida		c					
Hawaii	b		b	d			
Idaho	b	b		b			
Illinois	a,b,c	c	a,b	d	a,c		
Indiana	a,b,c	c	d	d	c		
Iowa	a,b,c	c		d	c		
Kansas	a,b,c,d	b,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,d	c		
Louisiana	b,c	c	b,c	d	c		
Maryland	b	c	b,d	c,d		c,d	
Massachusetts	a,b,c	a,b,c	a	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c	a,c
Michigan	a,b	a,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c	a	a
Minnesota	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c
Missouri	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c	
Nebraska	a,b,c,d	c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	
New Jersey	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	b,c,d	d	c	d	a
New Mexico	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c,d	d	c		a,b,c,d
New York	a,b,c,d	c,d	a,b	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c,d	
North Carolina	a,b	c		d	c	a,b	a
Ohio	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,d	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,c	a,b
Oklahoma	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d		d	b
Tennessee	a,b,c,d	b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c	d	a,b,c,d
Texas	a,b,c,d	a,b,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c	a,b,c	a,b
Utah	a,b,c	b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c	a,b,d	
Washington	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d		a,b,c,d	

KEY:

- a elements of the law
- b how belt works and why important
- c "Buckle-Up" request
- d physical demonstration of belt use effectiveness or statistics

Table 4: PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES GEARED TOWARD SPECIFIC AUDIENCES

STATE	LICENSE RENEWALS	RENTAL CARS	INSURANCE PREMIUMS	NEW CARS	DRIVER'S MANUAL	DRIVER'S ED CLASSES	TRAFFIC SCHOOL	DOCTORS' OFFICES	EMERGENCY ROOM	CLASSROOM CURRICULUM
California	a,c	a,c	a,b,c	b,c	a,b	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	b,c	c	a,b,c,d
Connecticut	b,c	c				c,d	a	c	c	b
District of Columbia	c	c			a	a,b,c		a,b,c	a,b,c	a,b,c,d
Florida		b,c				b		b	b	b
Hawaii	b	c	b,c	c		a,b	a	b,c		b
Idaho	b,c				b	b		a,b,c,d		b
Illinois			a		b	a,b,c		a,b,c		a,b,c
Indiana	c				b	b	b,d	b,c	b	c
Iowa				c	a,b,c	b,c	b,c	c		
Kansas	a,c	c		c	a,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	c		b,c,d
Louisiana				c		a,b,c,d				
Maryland		c		c	b	b,c,d	b,d		c	b,c,d
Massachusetts	c				b	b		a,b,c	a,c	b,c
Michigan	a,c		a		a,b,c	a,b,c,d	b	a,b,c,d	a,b,c	a,b,c,d
Minnesota		c	c	c			a	a,b,c		a,b,c,d
Missouri					a,c	b		c	c	b
Nebraska	a,b,c,d	a			a,b	a,b,c,d	b	a,b,c		b,d
New Jersey	a,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d		a,b,c,d
New Mexico	a,b,c	a,b				a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	b,c	c	b,c
New York	b		a,b		a,b,c	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d		b,d
North Carolina	a,b,c	c		c	a	a,b	a,b	c		a,b,c
Ohio				c	a,b,c	a,b	a,b	b,c	b,c	a,b,c
Oklahoma		a,b,c,d		c		a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d		a,b,c,d
Tennessee	c			c		b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d
Texas				c		a,b,c		a,b,c		a,b,c
Utah						a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d	a,b,c	a,b	a,b,c,d
Washington	a				b	a,b,c,d				b,c,d

KEY:

a elements of the law
 b how belt works and why important

c "Buckle-Up" request
 d physical demonstration of belt use effectiveness or statistics

A-11

- the audience contacted,
- the degree to which targeted audiences were the audience reached and/or impacted,
- the timing of the message delivery relative to passage of the law, effective date, enforcement efforts and other community implementation efforts,
- the coordination of the PI&E with the other four "core" program factors, and
- the resources required to conduct this PI&E campaign.

EMPLOYER SUPPORT

In attempting to reach the four distinct populations -- the confirmed user, the future driver, the occasional user, and the confirmed non-user -- channels beyond those available through community support or through public information and education campaigns were sometimes useful. Another channel identified was the specific support of corporations or agencies through programs for their employees.

Four types of employers conducting employee programs were identified:

- state government agencies,
- local governments and agencies,
- military installations, and
- major corporations/employers.

The following types of employer support were identified:

- giving belt use directives to employees,
- distributing educational material,
- conducting incentive programs,
- having a representative on the Coalition,
- having a representative attending seminars/training workshops,
- taking a reduction in workman's compensation claims in cases of belt non-use,
- prohibiting use of corporate or agency vehicle by employee for non-use,
- reprimand for non-use, or
- job suspension for non-use.

Table A-5 shows the variety among the states in approaches to employer support.

The issues that were considered as possibly influencing the outcomes of employer support activities included:

- the type of industry or agency,
- the unique characteristics of the specific employer involved,
- the total number of employees,
- the number of employees reached,
- the type of jobs held by employees reached,

Table A-7
EMPLOYER SUPPORT

STATE	STATE GOV	LOCAL GOV	MILITARY	CORPORATIONS
California	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i
Connecticut	a		a	a
District of Columbia	a,b,d,e,f,h			a,b,c,e,h
Florida	a,d,f	a	a	a,b,d,e
Hawaii	a,b,d	b	a,h	a,b,c,e
Idaho	a,b,c,d	a,b,d	b,c,h,i	a,b,c,d,h,i
Illinois	a,b,d,e		a,b,h	a,b,d,e,g,h
Indiana	a,b,c,d,e,g,i	a,d,e	a,b,d,e,g,h	a,d,e,h,i
Iowa	a,b,c,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e	a,b,e,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,g,h,i
Kansas	a,b,d,e	a,b,c,e	a,b,c,g,h	a,b,c,e,f,h,i
Louisiana	a,b,d,e,h	a,b,d,e	a,b,e	a,b,c,d,e,g,h,i
Maryland	a,b,e,g,h,i	a,b,e,g,h,i	a,b,c,g	a,c,d,e,g,h,i
Massachusetts	a,b,d,e,h,i	a,b,c,e,h,i	a,b,e,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i
Michigan	a,b,d,e,f,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,d,e,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i
Minnesota	a,b,d,e,h,i	a,b,d,e,h	a,e,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i
Missouri	a,b,c,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,g	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,d,e,g
Nebraska	a,b,d,e,h,i	a,d,e,h,i	a,e,g,h	a,b,d,e,g,h,i
New Jersey	a,b,c,d,e,h,i	a,b,c,e,g,h	a,b,e,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,g,h
New Mexico	a,b,d,e,f,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,h	a,b,d,f,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h
New York	a,b,c,d,e	a,b,c,d,e		a,b,c,d,e,g
North Carolina	a,b,d,e,g,h	a,b,c,e,h	a,b,e,g,h	a,b,c,e,f,g,h
Ohio	a,b,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,d,e,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i
Oklahoma	a,b,c,d,e,f,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,f	a,b,c,d,e,f,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,f
Tennessee	a,b,c,d,e,g,h	a,b,c,d,e,g,h	a,b,c	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i
Texas	a,b,c,d,e,g,h	a,b,c,e,g,h	a,b,c,e,h	a,b,c,e,h
Utah	a,b,c,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,c,e,g	a,b,e,g,h	a,b,c,d,e
Washington	a,b,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,d,e,g,h,i	a,b,c,d,e,g,h,i

KEY:

- | | |
|---|--|
| a directives to employees on belt use | f policy of considering non-use of belt as contributory negligence in workers' compensation claims |
| b distributing educational material on belt use | g policy of suspension from use of government corporation vehicle for seat belt non-use |
| c sponsoring incentives programs for belt use | h delivering reprimand for belt non-use |
| d having representative on committees/coalitions or in networks | i policy of suspension from job for belt non-use |
| e having representative attending seminars/training workshops | |

- the synergy between the type of support and type of corporation or agency giving it,
- timing of that support relative to passage of the law, effective date, enforcement efforts and other community implementation efforts,
- coordination with the other four "core" program factors, and
- the resources required to generate and maintain that support.

ENFORCEMENT

The enforcement approaches identified included not only those associated with warnings or citations (primary or secondary), but also a number of other such as:

- membership in the coalition,
- attending seminar/training workshops,
- distributing material to the public,
- directives/communications to officers from their superior officer,
- making media appearances,
- lobbying,
- recording belt use on accident reports,
- having a belt use policy specifically for officers,
- having a selective or priority enforcement policy for belt use, or
- combining belt use enforcement with enforcement efforts on DWI or child restraint violations.

Table A-6 shows the variety of approaches used in the 26 states and the District of Columbia.

ADJUDICATION

Approaches to this final program factor included:

- involvement of judges in formulating the law,
- membership of judges in the coalition,
- attendance of judges at seminars or training workshops, and
- willingness of judges to uphold the violations.

Table A-7 shows the variety among the states in the approaches in adjudication currently used.

OTHER FACTORS

One other factor emerged as important in implementing programs in support of state mandatory use laws: the availability of resources for program implementation. These resources included both cash and non-cash sources and encompassed both tangible and intangible dimensions. Cash sources included:

Table A-6: ENFORCEMENT BY STATE

STATE	COALITION MEMBER	ATTEND SEMINARS	DIST.: MAT. TO PUBLIC	DIRECTIVES	APPEARANCES	LOBBYING	BELT USE ON ACCIDENT REPORTS	USE POLICY
California	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Connecticut		X	X					
District of Columbia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Hawaii								X
Idaho	X	X	X			X	X	X
Illinois	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Indiana	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Iowa	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Kansas	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Louisiana	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Maryland		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Massachusetts		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Michigan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Missouri	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nebraska	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
New Jersey	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
New Mexico	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
New York	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
North Carolina	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ohio	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Tennessee	X	X	X		X		X	X
Texas	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Utah		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Washington		X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table A-6 (continued)

STATE	FINE FOR NON-USE	SELECTIVE ENFORCEMENT	PRIORITY ENFORCEMENT	WARNINGS	SECONDARY CITATION	SECONDARY WITH DWI	SECONDARY WITH CR	PRIMARY CITATION
California	X		X	X	X		X	
Connecticut								X
District of Columbia	X			X	X	X	X	
Florida	X			X				
Hawaii								X
Idaho		X		X	X			
Illinois	X			X	X			X
Indiana								
Iowa			X	X				
Kansas	X			X				
Louisiana			X	X	X	X	X	
Maryland	X			X			X	
Massachusetts	X			X	X			
Michigan	X		X	X	X	X		
Minnesota	X		X	X	X			
Missouri		X	X	X	X			
Nebraska			X	X	X		X	
New Jersey	X		X	X	X	X	X	
New Mexico	X		X	X				X
New York		X						X
North Carolina	X			X				
Ohio	X		X		X	X	X	
Oklahoma	X							
Tennessee				X				
Texas	X	X		X	X			X
Utah	X			X		X		
Washington				X				

Table A-7

ADJUDICATION/JUDGES' INVOLVEMENT BY STATE

STATE	FORMULATING LAW	COALITION MEMBER	ATTEND SEMINAR	UPHOLDING VIOLATIONS
California		X	X	X
Connecticut				
District of Columbia	X		X	
Florida				
Hawaii	X		X	
Idaho				
Illinois		X	X	
Indiana				
Iowa			X	
Kansas				
Louisiana				
Maryland			X	
Massachusetts				X
Michigan				X
Minnesota	X		X	
Missouri		X	X	
Nebraska				
New Jersey				X
New Mexico		X	X	X
New York		X	X	X
North Carolina				
Ohio		X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	X	
Tennessee		X	X	
Texas				X
Utah			X	
Washington				

- Section 402,
- Section 403,
- Traffic Safety Now,
- State and local governments, and
- private sector sources.

Non-cash sources included:

- auto dealers donating cars,
- volunteer time,
- service clubs and corporations donating safety seats and/or prizes for incentive programs,
- radio and TV stations donating airtime, and
- state and local governments contributing office space and/or staff.

Table A-8 shows the resources available in FY1986 for state programs implemented in each state.

The tangible dimensions included amount of money, staff time, volunteer hours, value of merchandise donated, rental value of donated space and cost per minute for airtime. The intangible dimensions mentioned included the energy, commitment and enthusiasm of the people involved in implementing the programs.

SUMMARY

Five "core" program factors and over 80 approaches to those factors were identified. Tables A-1 through A-8 showed some of the approaches used in each state. Those tables were structured so that if a state used a particular approach, it is indicated; if a particular approach is not indicated, it might have been used in that state but it was not mentioned by the state coordinator in the discussion of program activities employed to encourage safety belt use.

Table A-8: FUNDING FOR SAFETY BELT LAW BY STATE IMPLEMENTATION

STATE	SEC 402	SEC 403	TSN	OTHER AMT AND SOURCE	NON CASH CONTRIBUTIONS
California	\$1,600,000	\$200,000	\$100,000	\$0	car donated, air time, billboard space
Connecticut	\$450,000	\$80,000	\$100,000	\$118,000	volunteers
District of Columbia	\$53,000	\$5,000	\$250,000	\$0	safety seats donated
Florida	\$120,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	
Hawaii	\$136,000	\$0	\$63,000	\$50,000 state/local match	printing, airtime
Idaho	\$176,800	\$0	\$140,000	\$35,000	
Illinois	\$622,294	\$114,000	\$300,000	\$1,000,000	
Indiana	\$286,000	\$0	\$125,000	\$0	volunteers
Iowa	\$149,300	\$0	\$120,000	\$0	survey
Kansas	\$27,528	\$0	\$0	\$12,000 state	radio/tv production
Louisiana	\$263,816	\$80,000	\$167,000	\$0	safety councils, AAA
Maryland	\$163,000	\$0	\$125,000	\$0	state and local in-kind contr.
Massachusetts	\$526,321	\$78,000	\$100,000	\$0	volunteers
Michigan	\$359,000	\$105,000	\$700,000	\$0	
Minnesota	\$338,100	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	car seats, airtime, printing
Missouri	\$512,933	\$20,000	\$300,000	\$0	volunteers
Nebraska	\$81,000	\$80,000	\$26,000	\$22,000 state	
New Jersey	\$293,590	\$121,000	\$125,000	\$0	volunteers
New Mexico	\$40,000	\$79,557	\$247,000	\$10,000 staff time	
New York	\$1,500,000	\$650,000	\$200,000	\$0 state/local/corp.	office space
North Carolina	\$314,700	\$80,000	\$75,000	\$0	
Ohio	\$608,000	\$75,216	\$0	\$100,000 state	state in-kind
Oklahoma	\$431,538	\$10,000	\$0	\$100,000 private AAA, Red Cr.	volunteers
Tennessee	\$382,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Texas	\$1,330,000	\$147,500	\$1,000,000	\$0	office space
Utah	\$84,500	\$0	\$130,000	\$11,000	
Washington	\$622,000	\$80,000	\$200,000	\$0	volunteer task forces

APPENDIX B

REVIEW OF 12 MODEL COMMUNITY PROGRAM SAFETY BELT PROJECTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR APPENDIX B

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	B-1
Model Community Programs	B-1
Introduction to Program Factors Associated with Belt Use	B-2
SUMMARY OF CROSS-SITE COMPARISONS	B-3
Common Program Characteristics	B-3
Leadership	B-9
Task Forces	B-12
Objectives	B-17
Community Support with Activities	B-23
Program Characteristics	B-37
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	B-47
Observation Data	B-47
Attitudinal Surveys	B-48
GENERAL SUMMARY	B-50
CASE STUDY EXHIBITS	B-53
1. Natchitoches, Louisiana	B-53
2. Kalamazoo County, Michigan	B-57
3. Jackson, Mississippi	B-61
4. North Plainfield, New Jersey	B-67
5. Santa Fe, New Mexico	B-71
6. Rockland County, New York	B-75
7. Suffolk County, New York	B-79
8. Bismark, North Carolina	B-85
9. Tulsa, Oklahoma	B-91
10. San Antonio and Bexar County, Texas	B-95
11. Utah County, Utah	B-99
12. Skagit County, Washington	B-107

INTRODUCTION

This appendix summarizes 12 Model Community Programs (MCPs) funded by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to establish exemplary local projects to increase safety belt use. In order to receive NHTSA funds for the MCP, each community was required to evaluate their safety belt use program. A summary of these evaluations was prepared to highlight the successful aspects of the MCPs for dissemination by the Traffic Safety Program at NHTSA. This appendix includes a description of each program, indicating the activities in each program; our critical assessment of program activities across programs; and the relationship of program activities to the effectiveness of the programs. This chapter introduces the categories of program activities that were used to summarize the evaluations of the MCPs.

MODEL COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

The development of comprehensive community programs throughout the country was one approach, among several, which DOT/NHTSA pursued to increase safety belt and child safety seat usage. The model community programs described in this appendix were demonstration projects encouraged by NHTSA through its distribution of Federal Section 403 dollars. In addition to the Section 403 money, NHTSA assisted the projects by providing technical and planning assistance.

The Section 403 funding was used by NHTSA as an incentive for communities to implement the programs. Specifically, the funds were made available to communities for the evaluation of comprehensive occupant restraint programs. By comprehensive, NHTSA meant a program that included public information, use policies/employer programs, face-to-face education, and incentives. Besides the Section 403 dollars, sites may have obtained funding from additional sources. For example, some of the communities received Section 402 dollars from their respective States. Still, these were low budget programs highly dependent on volunteer participation and contributions from their communities.

NHTSA conducted its first workshop on community programs in September 1983. Over the next two years, more than a dozen model community programs were established across the country. Although the comprehensive occupant restraint program was something that was brand new, a number of the sites had previous experience with child safety programs. This was used as a nucleus from which to branch out.

Since the onset of the demonstration projects, numerous other communities have established similar programs. This expansion has built grass roots support leading in some cases to the passage of legislation.

For many of the demonstration projects, mandatory safety belt usage laws were enacted at the state level during the course of the program.

Most of the model programs contracted with NHTSA for a period of approximately two years. Currently, the push at NHTSA no longer is for the single issue comprehensive safety belt program. It is now moving towards comprehensive community traffic safety programs that combine the safety belt message with other community safety issues.

INTRODUCTION TO PROGRAM FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH BELT USE

A recent report on the implementation of safety belt use laws¹ examined activities to increase safety belt use in eight communities located in states that had passed safety belt use laws. The study identified a core set of program activity categories that included over 80 individual activities. These program activities were identified through a number of sources, including the NHTSA central and regional office staff, state safety belt coordinators, and in the case study communities.

The original list of program activities consisted of five core factors: media, generating community support, public information and education, employer support, and enforcement and adjudication. Because the MCPs occurred prior to passage of safety belt use laws, enforcement and adjudication are not applicable to the MCP evaluations. We therefore have modified the list of program activities as suited by the information available in the evaluations. In addition to listing the activities within each category, we have also given an indication of the intensity or exposure of each activity.

The major categories of program activities used in this summary include media, community support, and public information and education.

The media category includes informational activities produced through radio, television and newspapers. These activities include public service announcements, paid advertisements, news stories, talk shows and promotional events.

Community support includes coalitions and community assistance with program activities. There was typically a task force coalition for each program, with committees established according to program needs. In addition, program activities were performed in each community by a variety of actors, including members of the media, police, local businesses, the medical community, celebrities, sports figures, civic organizations educators and public officials.

¹ Program Factors Associated With Seat Belt Use, H. Worthington. Prepared for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration under Contract No. DTNH22-86-C-07338, June, 1987.

Public information and education includes distributing materials such as pamphlets, posters and bumper stickers, presentations in local settings, displays and demonstrations, school activities, contacting local businesses, outreach to other areas, and special events and campaigns, such as local, citywide promotions.

Finally, we have included a section on the program evaluations that were carried out in each model community. Evaluation measures usually include a variety of data related to assessing safety belt use before, during and after the MCP. These data include observation data, telephone surveys and opinion polls.

SUMMARY OF CROSS-SITE COMPARISONS

Basic strategies did not vary substantially across the twelve model community programs selected for review. All sought to increase community usage of safety belts through educational programs, special activities, and various forms of incentives. What differentiated the programs was not so much the types of things they chose to do but rather how they went about doing them. The following discussion summarizes the reviews of evaluation reports of the model community programs, supplemented with discussions with NHTSA staff responsible for monitoring each site. The discussions are followed, where possible, with tables presenting specific information from the individual site reports.

Common Program Characteristics

Dissemination of information typically occurred through presentations to groups, booths or displays set up at fairs or other community events, special program-sponsored events, and media coverage. Presentations usually entailed a speech, a film, and the distribution of literature with perhaps other items included (e.g., stickers, posters, keychains). Although program objectives often targeted multiple segments of the community for safety belt activities, presentations occurred far more frequently before school audiences than any other specific group. Businesses or employers, another key target group, were contacted to varying degrees across sites. The message delivery methods are summarized in Table B-1 and discussed below.

Booths erected at county fairs, health fairs, shopping malls, and other community events or sites offered program exposure to large numbers of persons at minimal cost. Prominently featured posters drew attention to the program's safety messages while program staff or volunteers handed out brochures and other informational literature. Frequently, small incentives (balloons, stickers, candy, pencils, or other relatively inexpensive articles) were used to entice passersby. Crowd interest also was obtained through collision simulations using the "convincer," a crash simulator.

Most of the programs organized community-wide incentive campaigns. Often this involved having a spotter out on the road who either stopped drivers wearing safety belts and gave them some reward or else called in

the license plate number to a participating radio station that then announced it over the air (drivers who heard the announcement and contacted the station received a prize). Besides being given small items, winners became eligible for larger gifts and grand prize drawings.

Other incentive campaigns were targeted toward specific groups. A number of sites developed poster contests for younger children and safety belt usage competitions among high schools. Employers occasionally were targeted for competitions or incentives. More often, they were lobbied by program staff to establish policies and programs that may include incentives.

Each of the model programs sought media coverage of project activities and events. All met with some degree of success. Of the three major media (radio, TV, newspaper), radio proved most receptive to communicating program information and sponsoring activities. Radio differs from the other media in that it can reach individuals while they are riding in automobiles. Moreover, radio outlets tend to outnumber local TV stations or newspapers. Additionally, radio time is a less expensive commodity than TV time.

All of the model programs were required to survey community safety belt usage before, during, and after the contracted life of the program. Without exception, observation data showed higher usage after program completion, compared to baseline measures taken prior to program initiation. Cross-site comparisons are difficult owing to variation across programs in survey methodology and conditions, as well as changes in methodology occurring within programs from observation to observation. What is clear is that when states enacted safety belt use laws, a sharp increase in safety belt usage usually followed.

The 12 model community programs shared many of the same characteristics. The programs typically involved presentations to groups, display booths at community events, incentive campaigns, media coverage, and surveys of community safety belt usage. Presentations occurred more frequently before school audiences than any other specific group. Radio tended to be more active than the other major media in providing coverage/information and sponsoring events. While all sites showed some increase in safety belt use during the course of their programs, the sharpest jumps occurred after enactment of state safety belt use laws.

Table B-1: MESSAGE DELIVERY METHODS

Site	Materials Used	Delivery Methods Used	Special Target Audiences
	(List)		(S)tudents (B)usinesses etc.
Natchitoches, LA	Films/Filmstrips Pens Decals Auto Trash Bags Brochures Caps Key Rings Balloons T-shirts Convincer Beltman Materials	Presentations (95) Displays Motorcycle Patrol Police Dept. Open Houses State Meetings/Lobbying Weekly Newspaper Articles Publicized Phone Number	Schools Employers
Kalamazoo, MI	Films Brochures Keychains Decals	Speaking Engagements(103) Exhibits/Displays (28) Saved by the Belt awards and testimonials Seasonal press releases PSAs Quarterly newsletter	Businesses Schools Medical Community
Jackson, MS	Films Brochures/Pamphlet Coloring Books Convincer (Police) Wrecked Car (Pol.) Stickers Pledge Cards Posters Beltman Kits Events Portfolio	Presentations Displays/Demonstrations Billboards/Signs Street Banners Beltmobile News Releases PSAs Kickoff Ceremonies Banquets Letters to Businesses Corporate Workshop Safety Council Newsletter Saved by the Belt Testi- monials Picture Contest	Infants/Toddlers Police Employers Schools

Table B-1: MESSAGE DELIVERY METHODS (cont.)

Site	Materials Used	Delivery Methods Used	Special Target Audiences
	(List)		(S)tudents (B)usinesses etc.
North Plainfield, NJ	Films Video tapes Slides Safety handouts Logos on city metered mail Banners Signs Posters Signs Proclimation Pledge cards Balloons Key chains Convincer Litter Boxes Stickers Pamphlets	Presentations Displays/demonstrations US Mail	Students Elderly Adults
Santa Fe, NM	Stickers Brochures Posters Films Slide Shows Convincer	Presentations Displays Employer Workshops Car Seat Clinic High School Incentive Programs	Schools Employers
Rockland County, NY	Stickers Brochures Literature Paycheck Stuffers Decals Posters Signs Film clip	Presentations Displays Letters sent to businesses	County employees Corporate sector Medical/health community Education Law Enforcement
Suffolk County, NY	Films Brochures Pledge cards Book covers PSA's Posters/signs	Presentations Exhibits Radio Orientations meetings Transit advertising	Students Businesses Health care staff Auto dealers County Employees

Table B-1: MESSAGE DELIVERY METHODS (cont.)

Site	Materials Used	Delivery Methods Used	Special Target Audiences
	(List)		(S)tudents (B)usinesses etc.
Bismark, ND	Convincer Tokens Films Video Pamphlets Posters Buttons Coloring books Tray liners T shirts	Presentations (15) Coloring Contest Speeches PSA's Talk shows Mascot BUB (47 presentations), BUB's Birthday Party.	Students Businesses State Employees
Tulsa, OK	Films Video Posters Bumper stickers Brochures Paycheck inserts	Speeches/presentations Exhibits Workshops	Students Civic groups
San Antonio, TX	Buttons/Tokens Posters Speaker's Bureau Kit Events Materials Literature Coupons Giant Firecracker With Information Buckle Up Coins Comics Brochures Films	Presentations Displays Billboards PSAs Mascot Parades Speaker's Bureau Workshops Teacher's Council Newsletter News Releases Safety Belt Mass	Schools Employers

Table B-1: MESSAGE DELIVERY METHODS (cont.)

Site	Materials Used	Delivery Methods Used	Special Target Audiences
	(List)		(S)tudents (B)usinesses etc.
Utah County, UT	Films 3 Seconds to Safety packets Reminder Cards Literature Candy Balloons Pencils Stickers/Decals T-shirts Consumer Health Books Pledge Cards Tabletop Display Posters Convincer Curriculum Packets for Churches Save Your Family Kits Trooper Tron Robot	Presentations Displays Mascot Provo Town Meeting First Aid Curricula at Red Cross Dissemination of informa- tion by Girl Scouts Instruction to Cub Scouts by Pack Leaders Health Risk Assessment Workshop Curriculum Attachments to Birth Certificate Worksheets Signs Safety Belt Newsletter PSAs Corporate Seat Belt Conference News Releases Church Distribution of Materials Parades	Schools Corporations Churches Civic Groups Parents of Young Children
Skagit County, WA	Films It's a Matter of Time materials Real Connection materials Here's Looking at You Two materials Pencils Car Litter Bags Book Covers Instructional Peechies Posters Stickers Color Books Pamphlets	Presentations (53) Displays Workshops for Educators News Releases PSAs Speaker's Bureau Survey of Preschools Survey and Letters to Doctors and Dentists Child Restraint Inspec- tion Stations	Schools Employers

Leadership

Natchitoches recorded the smallest gains in safety belt usage across the twelve sites. Moreover, its final report was more critical of program functioning than were the other evaluations. The report attributed difficulties with the Natchitoches program to the failure of the Community Involvement Coordinator to assume an appropriate leadership role. Specifically, the Coordinator:

- Avoided high profile tasks;
- Did not initiate contacts with those segments of the community with which she was unfamiliar or uncomfortable;
- Was not adept at recruiting volunteers;
- Was unable to plan tasks for those persons who did volunteer;
- Did not overcome initial resistance to involvement by businesses through persistence or new approaches;
- Overall, lacked the aggressiveness needed to promote the program within the community.

Problems in program functioning related to the Coordinator also were noted by the Utah County project. Here, the Coordinator was new to the community and therefore unfamiliar with its members, resources, or "peculiarities." According to the report, this caused the Coordinator to do the work himself rather than delegate tasks, feeling that it would be easier that way. The result, wrote the evaluators, was that fewer goals were accomplished than could have been. Although a new project coordinator sought to involve task force members during the second year, members continued to view themselves solely as an advisory board. Other difficulties arose from changes in administration at the local, state, and federal levels along with the aforementioned departure of the local coordinator midway through the project. This led to confusion and misunderstanding over expectations. Changes in program leadership were not uncommon across sites (e.g., Natchitoches, Skagit County, North Plainfield, Utah County, San Antonio), leading in some instances to major gaps in the program. Explanations for the turnover may include directors moving to higher paying positions or frustration with lack of community involvement.

Evaluator comments in the Tulsa final report indicated that the project coordinator tended to devote much of her time to one-time presentations that were usually child-safety-seat related. Minimal effort was expended on long-range, comprehensive efforts to institutionalize safety belt activities and programs among target groups. The evaluator concluded that less in the way of overall program development was accomplished than had been hoped.

The Kalamazoo final report concluded that the "most important ingredient for a successful program is an enthusiastic, energetic coordinator or task force chair. Knowledge of the safety belt issues are not as important as the personality of the individual coordinating the program." Comments from the project officer indicated that a major strength of the coordinator was the ability to work with volunteer organizations. The coordinator might have had a little difficulty in working with employers and been hampered somewhat by inexperience in working with the media.

The Jackson project officer considered the strengths of the program coordinator to be a dynamic personality, being persuasive, being media-oriented, and having contacts. The coordinator tended to do the work herself rather than delegate tasks to others. Perhaps more could have been accomplished if the coordinator had been better at delegating, however the coordinator simply might not have been able to find persons to whom she could assign various tasks as individual support of the program was somewhat lacking.

The Skagit County project officer characterized the program there as a one-man show run by the coordinator. The program did not obtain the level of involvement from the community that had been hoped, did not engage in much outreach to segments of the community other than the schools, and achieved a number of specified objectives later than was originally planned. However, the coordinator possessed a great deal of enthusiasm for the program as well as strong feelings of improving belt use among youth (the coordinator had children of his own, which may explain the strong emphasis on the schools). Enthusiasm also was considered (by the project officer) to be a major strength of the North Plainfield director, along with being a persuasive person, being well-organized, and having some good ideas. The Suffolk County project officer termed that community's program director an excellent organizer, effective speaker, and skillful allocator of resources.

In contrast to the project coordinators at many of the other sites, the Rockland County program director was able to get other persons to do things rather than run the whole show herself. According to the project officer, the program director came from a family influential in state politics and had numerous high-level contacts. She knew how to get things done, knew who could get it done, and was able to call on people to get things accomplished.

No single set of activities can define the leadership or management skills needed for a successful safety belt program since it will necessarily vary according to the persons and conditions involved. Still, certain general properties may be noted. The key demand placed upon project leaders is to bring their message to the forefront of community awareness. This requires continual efforts to penetrate the overall community and its various segments. Yet this must be accomplished with limited contracted resources. As a consequence, project leaders needed to be proficient at resource allocation such that the greatest effect was generated at the lowest cost. Moreover, they needed to be adept at

developing resources; i.e., getting the community to contribute toward the attainment of program goals. These things were not done haphazardly but rather with careful thought and planning.

Program success relied to a large extent on the ability to enlist members of the community to assist/support program activities as well as have them extend the program to untapped groups. Consequently, project managers required a certain facility in contacting and dealing with others. They had to be able to express the objectives of the program in a cogent manner and motivate others to become involved. It was also important that project managers not waste the persons or organizations that agreed to commit to the program (have something specific to assign them). Lastly, project managers needed to provide adequate support for activities carried out by others under the auspices of the program (materials, information, training, logistics, etc.).

Media coverage required more than sending out news releases and PSAs. It entailed building a relationship with the various media outlets. A number of the programs succeeded in getting various media actively involved in project activities.

Again, these are all general qualities that were important to program management. A measure of detail is provided in the sections that follow.

The leadership provided by the program coordinator was crucial to program effectiveness. The key demand placed on coordinators was to bring their safety message to the forefront of community awareness through a volunteer-based comprehensive community program. This required a certain aggressiveness on their part, mixed with a general facility in dealing with people and skill at deploying resources to the greatest advantage. Programs encountered difficulties in meeting overall objectives when coordinators concentrated their efforts only on those program segments with which they felt most comfortable or adept. Additionally, there were suggestions that some programs could have accomplished more if their coordinators had been more proficient at delegating tasks, rather than taking on everything themselves. However, the coordinators simply might not have had anyone available to whom they could delegate.

Task Forces

Setting up task forces composed of key members of the community is one method of building links between the program and its targeted population(s). Yet while most of the programs acknowledged the formation of such groups, they were not uniformly successful. What seemed to make a difference was the general orientation of the task force, whether its members considered themselves to be solely an advisory body or else took on a more participatory role. Task force comparisons are listed in Table B-2 below. In Natchitoches, the Coordinator was unable to secure volunteer assistance in program activities from the citizens' advisory committee, eventually terming the group ineffective. Most Utah County task force members likewise viewed themselves as an advisory council only, and not as a task force with specific responsibilities. Here, there was a major attempt by a new project coordinator to get task force members actively involved during the second project year. The endeavor failed, forcing the coordinator to continue shouldering much of the burden. This failure suggests general difficulties in altering the orientation of fixed task forces once certain norms have been established. By extension, program managers need to communicate explicit expectations concerning task force responsibilities right from the beginning.

Other task forces, such as in Kalamazoo, were more active in program functioning. Often, task forces were comprised of persons who were very active and others who were not (initiators and followers). For example, the hospital and Red Cross people were far and away the most active members on the Kalamazoo Task Force. The police provided support but didn't initiate activities.

Task forces such as those in Santa Fe, Bismarck, and Kalamazoo represented a broad spectrum of their respective communities. Where task force membership is limited in scope, or where no task force exists, programs may end up having their efforts overly focused on those portions of the community that they find most accessible. For example, in Skagit County (with no reported task force), activities largely entailed the schools, child safety restraint programs, and display booths set up at fairs or shopping malls. Indications were that fewer programs were presented to adult organizations than was planned in the objectives, and that objectives concerning the implementation of employer safety programs were achieved largely through a special one-month community campaign that occurred near the end of the contract period.

The Jackson project initially attempted to get task force members to plan and carry out activities. However, the project was unable to obtain this type of involvement from individuals. The evaluation report attributed the situation to the press of busy schedules, a remark repeated in the Bismarck report. This resulted in the Jackson project staff assuming full responsibility for developing activities, with community members called on for assistance as needed. The task force members served as conduits to their respective organizations for the

project staff.

The Suffolk County program also depended on task force members for access to groups, as well as for financial resources and in-kind contributions. The project hoped to get the task force to "buy into" the program by making them responsible for planning activities. Regular meetings were held where members put forth ideas and assigned responsibility for implementation. As this occurred, the project began to be "owned" by the task force members and their respective groups. The process was successful for some activities but unsuccessful for others as some members failed to follow up on their assignments.

There were indications that programs benefitted when new members (translating into new perspectives and talents) were periodically added to the volunteer ranks. In Jackson, the task force changed over time as dictated by the needs of the program; i.e., new persons were brought on board who could help the program achieve certain goals or carry out certain activities. According to the San Antonio evaluation report, a changing membership in its volunteer base brought fresh insight into program efforts.

Volunteer task forces provided links between the program and the community. Programs often found that task force members considered their role to be advisory in nature, without any responsibilities for active participation. Even where task forces were considered active, there tended to be a small core of persons who did all the work. This suggests that coordinators need to communicate explicit expectations concerning task force responsibilities right from the start. Programs used task force members as conduits to their respective organizations. They were likely to benefit from including a broad spectrum of the community on the task force. Bringing in new members during the course of the program may also benefit programs by adding new perspectives and avenues of access.

Table B-2: TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Site	Had Task Force (Yes)(No)	Task Force Members	Subcommittees (Names)	Member Participation in Activities (High/All) (High/Some/Whom) (Low/All)
Natchitoches, LA	Yes			Low/All
Kalamazoo, MI	Yes	Hospitals Southwest Michigan EMS Area Police Departments County Road Commission State Department of Transportation Local School District Automobile Club of Michigan State Driver Improvement Center State Office of Highway Planning	Community Groups Corporate Education Medical Media/PR	High/Some/Hospital Red Cross Police
Jackson, MS	Yes	Changed according to the needs the program.	Work Projects Child Restraints Seat Belt Policy Public Awareness	High/Some/Mostly a 2-person task force (program staff) with others added as needed.
North Plainfield, NJ	Yes	Project Director Mayor Traffic Safety Director Chief of Police Representative from New Jersey Office of Highway Safety Project Coordinator	None	High/Some Project Director Police Sergeant
Santa Fe, NM	Yes	State Gov./Health Services Division City Government Local School District Local College Local Hospital Local Media Chamber of Commerce Gas Company of New Mexico Board of Independent Insurance Agents of New Mexico		

Table B-2: TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP (cont.)

Site	Had Task Force	Task Force Members	Subcommittees	Member Participation in Activities
	(Yes)(No)		(Names)	(High/All) (High/Some/Whom) (Low/All)
Rockland County, NY	Yes	Hospital Traffic safety board Police Schools Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Highway department Local Corporations City Employees United Parcel Service County Employees	None	High/All
Suffolk County, NY	Yes	Medical/health Police PTA Safety office Insurance company Transit company Teamsters union Auto Dealer	Business/Employer Medical/Health Education Enforcement Community Outreach Volunteer	High/All
Bismark, ND	Yes	State Highway Department Hospitals Public Schools Chamber of Commerce Broadcasting Company Department of Health Mayor Utility Company Ministerial Association Police Department City Traffic Department Boy & Girl Scouts State Safety Council Telephone Company City/County Offices	Civic Activities Fund Raisers/ Incentives Media Coverage School Programs Speakers Bureau	Low/All

Table B-2: TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP (cont.)

Site	Had Task Force	Task Force Members	Subcommittees	Member Participation in Activities
	(Yes)(No)		(Names)	(High/All) (High/Some/Whom) (Low/All)
Tulsa, OK	Yes	Utility Companies Safety Council Medical Centers, Hospitals Local Businesses Insurance Companies PTA Boy and Girl Scouts Camp Fire Girls American Red Cross Jaycees Police Media AAA NHTSA Regional Representative City of Tulsa Motor Vehicle Manufacturers	None	High/Some: The Coordinator did over 62% of presentations. Local hospital did another 22% (on child seats).
San Antonio, TX	No			
Utah County, UT	Yes	County Commission County Dental Society County Medical Society School District Local Churches PTA Hospitals Local Steel Corporation Law Enforcement Red Cross Local Women's Council		High/Some/PTA, Law Enforcement
Skagit County, WA	No			

Objectives

Most of the programs specified intermediate or overall objectives that the projects were to attain. Program objectives across sites are presented in Table B-3. In many instances these referred to the segments of the community that were to be targeted, programs and activities that were to be implemented, and materials that were to be distributed. Goals often were broadly written, although some projects included the numbers of contacts, presentations, or programs they expected to conduct.

Since increasing safety belt usage was the principal concern of the projects, some programs set specific community usage rates against which to measure their success. Whether the higher figures were achieved depended on how realistic they were. Programs whose goal it was to raise usage by 10 or 20 percentage points stood a reasonable chance of meeting their objective. Those counting on a sharper increase tended to be disappointed.

Programs tended to set goals for themselves, many of which were stated in general terms. Whether goals were attained depended in large measure on how realistic they were.

Table B-3: PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Site	Program Goals (list goals)	Scope-Overall/ Intermediate	Goals Accomplished
		(O/I)	(Yes/No)
Natchitoches, LA	Completion of a broad outline of contemplated tasks.	I	No
	Report baseline observation data.	I	Yes
	Completion of calendar of tasks.	I	No
	Monthly status reports of task performance.	I	No
	Monthly reporting of observation data to be used for incentive program.	I	No
	Monthly reporting of the results of the reduction of the above data.	I	No
	Monthly process monitoring reports submitted to NHTSA.	I	Yes
	Statistically significant differences in vehicle accidents between baseline and first and second years.	O	Year 1: No Year 2: Yes, Lower
	Statistically significant differences in vehicle accidents between baseline and each program year for specified patrol zones.	O	Year 1: Yes, Higher Year 2: Yes, Higher
	Statistically significant differences in driver usage of safety belts between baseline and years 1 & 2.	O	Year 1: No Year 2: Yes, Higher
	Statistically significant differences in passenger use of safety belts between baseline and years 1 & 2.	O	Year 1: No Year 2: No
	Statistically significant differences in infant use of restraints between baseline and years 1 & 2.	O	Year 1: Yes Year 2: Yes Higher
	Parents of 80%+ of second graders exposed to Beltman will indicate a positive effect after each year.	O	Year 1: No Year 2: No
	80%+ of parents loaned infant restraints will report habitual use at the end of each program year.	O	Year 1: No Year 2: No
	At least 75% of community involvement tasks will have been completed by the end of each program year.	O	Year 1: No Year 2: No
All tasks on the Calendar of Tasks will equal at least 12 difficulty level 3 tasks (1-5 scale).	O	Year 1: No Year 2: No	
At least 8 businesses will have implemented programs to observe, measure, and reward employee belt use.	O	No	

Table B-3: PROJECT OBJECTIVES (cont.)

Site	Program Goals (list goals)	Scope-Overall/ Intermediate	Goals Accomplished
		(O/I)	(Yes/No)
Kalamazoo, MI	No specific program goals were listed although the materials did include task force goals.	-	-
Jackson, MS	Projected that the program would increase usage from 6% to at least 25%.	0	Yes
North Plainfield, NJ	None listed.		
Santa Fe, NM	None listed.		
Rockland County, NY	<p>General: Increase usage of occupant restraints to as near 100% as possible. Increase public awareness of the necessity of seat belts. Reduce severity of injuries from accidents. Counteract fallacies for not using seat belts.</p> <p>County Employees Program: Promote safety belt awareness and usage by county employees. Promote placement of bumper stickers on county vehicles to inform public of safety belt use. Distribute educational materials in paychecks and dash board decals.</p> <p>Hospitals: Work with hospitals to promote educational activities. Establish hospital employee programs and clinic training sessions. Develop joint education program with Child Restraint Loan Program. Promote the positive benefits of adult and child safety devices.</p> <p>Corporate Outreach: Implement Safety Belt Programs for all employees of corporations. Distribute educational materials to existing programs. Conduct seminars and presentations on Safety Belt Usage.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>I</p> <p>0</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>

Table B-3: PROJECT OBJECTIVES (cont.)

Site	Program Goals (list goals)	Scope-Overall/ Intermediate	Goals Accomplished
		(O/I)	(Yes/No)
Rockland County, NY (cont.)	<p>School Program:</p> <p>Conduct educational programs through public and private schools.</p> <p>Distribute Safety Belt materials and conduct Safety Belt Awareness programs for students and staff.</p> <p>Distribute materials to faculty and staff of the public/private school system, PTA and employees.</p> <p>Media:</p> <p>Continue public service announcements to promote seat belt use and awareness of the state SBUL.</p> <p>Promote positive benefits of occupant restraint use and the law.</p> <p>Develop use of the media to demonstrate and enhance the positive benefits of a comprehensive approach in promoting seat belt use</p> <p>Utilize local newspapers to initiate and develop ongoing articles pertaining to occupant restraint usage.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>
Suffolk County, NY	<p>Conduct a County Employee Safety Belt Program for about 10,000 employees</p> <p>Inform at least 115 businesses about advantages of safety belt programs.</p> <p>Implement at least 10 corporate safety belt programs by June, 1985.</p> <p>Set up employee safety belt programs at all 13 hospitals in county.</p> <p>Conduct an educational safety belt presentation for PTA.</p> <p>Distribute safety belt information to all school bus drivers and pupils transported.</p> <p>Present five 30-minute safety belt assemblies for grades K-12.</p> <p>Conduct safety belt awareness programs at local colleges/universities and conduct observational surveys.</p> <p>Present at least 100 safety belt awareness programs at schools and other community organizations.</p> <p>Broadcast at least 3 PSAs on at least 10 radio stations between 6/84 and 9/84.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>I</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>I</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>

Table B-3: PROJECT OBJECTIVES (cont.)

Site	Program Goals (list goals)	Scope-Overall/ Intermediate	Goals Accomplished
		(O/I)	(Yes/No)
Suffolk County, NY (cont.)	Establish a transit advertising campaign.	O	Yes
	Distribute safety belt pamphlets and materials to general public and community organizations.	O	Yes
Bismark, ND	Establish model city safety belt and child safety program.	I	Yes
	Increase safety and child seat usage rates from 2% and 6% to 25% in first year and 50% in the second.	I,O	No
	Generate enough community involvement to maintain a 40% usage rate.	O	No
	Coordinate the program with alcohol countermeasures program.	I	Yes
Tulsa, OK	Establish educational program in day care, K-5, and high schools.	O	Yes
	Establish in-house safety belt programs in business and industry.	O	No
	Cooperate with police and local media to encourage reporting belt use in accident investigations and media coverage.	O	Yes
	Establish local coalition to address the issue of occupant protection.	I	Yes
	Establish safety program that will perpetuate itself over time.	O	No
San Antonio, TX	To increase safety belt usage from 8.7% to at least 20% by the end of the contracting period.	O	Yes
	To develop major employer and community programs that become institutionalized as ongoing community health and safety activities.	O	Yes
	To measure the attitudes and awareness of the San Antonio community toward safety belt use and improve upon these attitudes and level of awareness.	O	No
Utah County, UT	To increase restraint usage from 14.3% to 40%.	O	No
	Development of a PTA parent night presentation to be presented at 50% of the county's schools by all 3 PTA districts.	O	No
	(Others not listed in final report).		

Table B-3: PROJECT OBJECTIVES (cont.)

Site	Program Goals (list goals)	Scope-Overall/ Intermediate	Goals Accomplished
		(O/I)	(Yes/No)
Skagit County, WA	To increase usership in the 0-12 age group by 10 percentage points.	O	Yes
	To increase usership in the general population by 5 percentage points.	O	Yes
	To provide for program continuity in the county.	O	Yes
	Acceptance of formal programs into 2 school districts after 2 years.	I	No
	To present programs to 40 adult organizations and 20 youth organizations by start of third year.	I	No
	To promote one poster contest by May of first year.	I	Yes
	To promote an essay contest by October of first year.	I	No
	To organize one public incentive program by January of second year.	I	No
	To increase the availability of infant and child restraints by 80% in the first year and 250% by the 3rd year.	I	No
	To sponsor two advertised child restraint inspection programs in both the first and second years.	I	No
	To build employer safety programs into ten companies by January of the third year.	I	No
To build public support for legislative and enforcement efforts by January of the third year.	I	Yes	

Community Support With Activities

All of the model community programs received some level of assistance from community members in promoting program objectives and carrying out activities. Sources of assistance included the media, businesses/corporations, schools, medical community, law enforcement, civic organizations, and local government/public officials. Media coverage is summarized in Table B-4, while overall community support comparisons are in Table B-5. What differed across programs was the degree of help extended by the various groups.

Media

Major media involvement (radio, TV, newspaper) took two general forms. Foremost of these was the media's role in communicating program information and activities. With radio, this included appearances on talk shows, PSAs, and buckle up reminders. TV tended to involve more measured use of talk shows and PSAs, with perhaps an occasional news segment covering the safety belt issue or special program activities. Local newspapers printed news releases, reported on program activities, and offered scattered other support such as indicating safety belt usage in accidents or providing space for columns.

Other than communicating information, the media at various sites immersed themselves in program promotional activities. Most often, this occurred when radio stations helped to run, and frequently cosponsored, community-wide incentive programs. The usual format had spotters calling in the license plate numbers of safety belt wearers, which then would be read over the air and make the drivers eligible for prizes. Other media involvement in promotions included newspaper cosponsorship of the Beltnobile in Jackson and the use of PM Magazine on a local TV station to promote an incentive program in San Antonio. Media involvement in specific activities may help to encourage longer term support. For example, a radio station that cosponsored one of the Jackson incentive programs became so involved that after the promotion officially ended, the station continued to remind drivers to buckle up during daily traffic reports. Also in Jackson, the newspapers cosponsoring the Beltnobile provided ongoing coverage of safety belt information and activities.

Media coverage was influenced by the location of the community. For example, North Plainfield is a bedroom community of New York City and falls within that metropolis' television market, which limited the ability of the project to target the community through the use of major media. Beyond this, residents tended to work outside of North Plainfield. There probably is not the same community interest in such places as there is in jurisdictions where most persons conduct their daily activities locally.

Media coverage across the program sites ranged from excellent to less than satisfactory. In Jackson, project staff were so pleased with the abundance of positive coverage they received that they hosted a luncheon

for the media to express their appreciation. Elsewhere, Natchitoches project evaluators indicated that the local publisher did not give the cooperation that had been expected, often failing to report program events. Similarly, the Utah County evaluation report noted an initial reluctance of the print media to cover program activities. This changed as the effort to pass a safety belt law gained momentum and the safety belt use issue became more newsworthy. The Bismarck project also encountered problems with newsworthiness. Overall, the project evaluator termed media coverage good. However, newspaper coverage tended to appear in the Browsing column instead of the news column because of the similarity of program activities. The project found it difficult to make the program newsworthy so it could receive constant attention.

The predilection of media to communicate primarily "newsworthy" information holds implications for the content mix of messages that programs seek to air, as well as the general functioning of programs. Program messages generally may be classified as one of two types - those that revolved around an informational message that persons should buckle up, and those that focused on activities or events related to the program. Both types received at least some media exposure. However, the ability to maintain the program in the public eye may well rest with the skill of project managers in adapting to the intrinsic nature of the media; i.e., its penchant for events-oriented communications. Jackson, where media coverage was considered exemplary, perhaps provides the clearest example. Here, a number of major campaigns or events were implemented upon which the media could focus. In most cases, these activities were for a set duration, after which the program moved on to new things. Thus, a certain events orientation within the program along with regular turnover of events (permitting turnover in media communications) corresponded with high media coverage.

Media coverage involved informational messages as well as communication of program activities. Media at various sites also involved themselves in the conduct of certain promotional events. The predilection of media to cover only what it considers "newsworthy" caused some problems for programs in maintaining media exposure. Keeping the program in the public eye may well depend on the ability to adapt the program to the events-oriented nature of the media. Media involvement in specific activities may also help to encourage longer term support.

Table B-4: MEDIA COVERAGE

Site	Level	Predominant Media Coverage	Coverage Regularity	Content Orientation
	(High) (Low)	(Radio)(TV) (Newspaper) (None Predominant)	(Ongoing) (Intermittent)	(Events-Oriented) (Informational) (Both)
Natchitoches, LA		Radio		
Kalamazoo, MI	Low	Newspaper	Intermittent	Events-Oriented
Jackson, MS	High	Radio	Ongoing	Both
North Plainfield, NJ	Low	Radio Local Cable TV	Ongoing	Informational
Santa Fe, NM		Radio		
Rockland County, NY	High	Newspaper	Ongoing	Informational
Suffolk County, NY	High	Radio Local Newspaper	Ongoing	Informational
Bismark, ND	Low	None Predominant	Ongoing	Both
Tulsa, OK	High	Newspaper	Ongoing	Informational
San Antonio, TX	High		Ongoing	Both
Utah County, UT		Radio		Both
Skagit County, WA	Low	Radio	Intermittent	Events-Oriented

Businesses/Corporations

Businesses and employers usually were approached for one of two reasons: to contribute in some manner to the program (donating prizes, volunteering resources, distributing materials) or else to set up policies and programs for their own employees. Many of the donations were for the incentive giveaway campaigns. Other donations included the use of business billboards or signs for safety belt messages. Businesses that made donations for incentive promotions often became visible partners in the campaign. For example, donors of grand prizes would likely become prominently featured cosponsors of the event. Lesser prizes often included food coupons that were redeemed by winners at fast food restaurants.

A stated objective in many of the programs was to have employers establish policies and set up programs for their employees. These efforts met with mixed success. The most concrete results seemed to relate to the implementation of some special type of initiative. For example, the employer policies and programs established in San Antonio were largely the result of the CEO Challenge. This was a major promotion in which businesses and corporations worked to raise safety belt usage among employees. In Jackson, several organizations took steps supporting safety belt usage after their executives attended a Corporate Workshop that explained the monetary benefits of mandatory safety belt use policies. Likewise, Utah County held a Corporate Safety belt Conference where chief executive officers and/or personnel directors received information and materials during the course of a luncheon. The Conference led to several companies establishing and promoting safety belt policies. Skagit County saw six cities adopt safety restraint policies for their employees as a result of a major community-wide incentive program.

Employers provided support by donating prizes for incentive programs, volunteering resources, and distributing materials. Many also established policies and set up programs for their employees. Special initiatives such as corporate workshops or conferences seemed particularly effective in generating employee programs.

Schools

Some school systems were more cooperative than others during efforts to introduce safety belt programs to pupils and students. For example, the Santa Fe project experienced difficulties in penetrating school curricula with awareness campaigns. The authors of the evaluation report speculated that "perhaps due to lay-offs throughout the school system including the driver education program, teachers and principals were not eager to take on any additional new duties." In Natchitoches, law enforcement staff encountered problems in scheduling Beltman presenta-

tions as the schools showed little interest in the activity. The officers decreased their level of Beltman activity during the second program year, instead encouraging classroom teachers to assume responsibility for presenting the Beltman materials.

The Utah County evaluation report stated that schools there were anxious to become involved with the Buckle Up program, largely due to the persistent efforts of task force members. The Provo School District PTA, which was represented on the community task force, helped to sponsor major activities and events designed for elementary school pupils. Significant activity by the PTA also was evident in San Antonio, where a national PTA mini-grant was obtained to support K-6 safety belt awareness programs.

In Rockland County, the project coordinator first gained the support of the County School Superintendent Association. The project then made requests to the eight school districts in the county asking that they distribute educational materials. Four did so at that time and the remaining four asked to be contacted again at a later date. The Suffolk County program found school administrators "very eager to institute education programs when presented with well planned 'canned' programs, easy to use curricula, and short training sessions for their teachers." The overall success of this project component was attributed to tailoring the program to "the individual needs and constraints of each school district."

Several of the evaluation reports mentioned specific efforts to train school staff. In Skagit County, workshops were held for teachers on the "Real Connection" and "Here's Looking at You, Two" programs. Other workshops were held for driver's education instructors. Project staff in Jackson instructed teacher representatives from nine elementary schools on effective use of Beltman kits. San Antonio held workshops pertaining to special promotions such as the High School Challenge and Project Graduation.

Many of the projects found school officials cooperative in setting up presentations/programs in the schools and distributing materials. Several PTAs were highly active in school safety belt programs.

Medical Community

Much of the involvement of the medical community revolved around hospital operation of child seat loaner programs as well as hospital/medical clinic sponsorship of health fairs.

Many of the reviewed programs were pre-dated by child safety restraint laws, leading to an early emphasis in this area. In Rockland County, the two-year Occupant Restraint Program summarized in this appendix grew out of the earlier Rockland County Child Restraint Program initiated with the

passage of New York State's Child Restraint Law. Elsewhere, Natchitoches had operated a law enforcement program that was started soon after passage of a city infant restraint ordinance. Additionally, passage of a Child Restraint Law in Mississippi shortly before start-up of the Jackson program prompted the project staff to concentrate their initial efforts in this area.

The evaluation reports generally showed hospitals as key community providers of infant loaner seats, with safety restraint programs extending support. The Jackson program supplied car seats to hospitals needing more units, gave advice on administrative procedures for keeping track of loaner seats, and provided information to a hospital interested in beginning a loaner program. The law enforcement component of the Natchitoches program worked closely with the local parish hospital in coordinating and running their infant restraint loaner program, with the car seats being returned to the police department for sanitation and reissuance. In Utah County, the safety restraint program provided educational materials to loaner programs run by local hospitals and the City-County Health Department as well as to prenatal class instructors (both in-hospital and out-of-hospital). Moreover, local hospitals attached a card explaining Utah's child restraint law to each birth certificate worksheet. Various Skagit County hospitals/medical centers were active participants in distributing loaner car seats. Skagit also had a Car Seat Hotline, provided as a service of a local medical auxiliary, that matched buyers and sellers of approved used child car seats and gave information about loaner programs.

Several of the evaluation reports (Natchitoches, Utah County, Skagit County, Rockland County) referred to health fairs sponsored by hospitals or other medical organizations, at which the safety restraint programs were invited to set up booths and displays. At these events, program staff handed out informational materials with perhaps some incentive items such as balloons.

Safety belt programs were instituted in hospitals and medical centers at various sites. Two hospital programs in Rockland County were designed to reach employees, patients, and visitors. Paycheck stuffers and bumper stickers were distributed to employees, posters were displayed in various departments, signs were placed in hospital parking lots, and materials were presented to new employees at orientation sessions. Moreover, materials were handed out in the emergency room and articles on safety belt use were included in hospital publications distributed both to patients and employees.

The Utah County program reported that a regional medical center established an employee safety belt incentive program that awarded prizes such as free car washes, first aid kits, auto accessory kits, and grand prizes. Furthermore, a nearby hospital initiated a safety belt policy and program for employees that included literature, posters, stickers, and a video tape. In San Antonio, several hospitals engaged in awareness campaigns and programs during the CEO Challenge. The Jackson report mentioned a safety belt awareness month for employees held at a local

hospital. Suffolk County hoped to establish employee programs in all 13 community hospitals. This goal was not achieved, although one hospital did institute a program that consisted of a pre-program observational survey, five presentations, and a pledge card program.

Much of the involvement of the medical community revolved around hospital operation of child seat loaner programs as well as sponsorship of health fairs. Many of the programs were predated by child safety restraint laws, leading to an early emphasis in this area. In addition, various medical facilities established safety belt programs for their employees.

Law Enforcement

Most of the evaluation reports indicated some level of support from law enforcement officials. This support could entail assistance with child restraint programs and enforcement of child restraint laws, assistance in conducting community-wide incentive programs, giving presentations or demonstrations related to safety belt use, or scattered other activities in support of the program. Moreover, it was not uncommon for law enforcement to be represented on the community task forces.

Police were instrumental in running much of the occupant restraint program in Natchitoches. Originally, they were responsible for the law enforcement component of the program which included distribution of information by a special motorcycle patrol, reporting sample observations of restraint use, making presentations to groups, manning displays that included the convincer, and helping to coordinate the infant restraint loaner program at the local parish hospital. The resignation of the Community Involvement Coordinator during the second year of the contract resulted in the Law Enforcement Coordinator assuming total responsibility for the program, thereby taking over all community involvement activities.

Other reports showed the police less involved in orchestrating programs, instead giving their cooperation and support to program activities. Jackson police assisted with the child passenger safety aspects of the project (issued warning cards developed by the project), gave demonstrations at public awareness events (operated a convincer, exhibited a demolished car), were featured on billboards with buckle up messages, and helped to promote community-wide incentive programs (put stickers on vehicles, involved in kickoff ceremonies). In Skagit County, the police stopped vehicles to distribute coupons and informational materials during the major community-wide incentive program. Police in Santa Fe also became involved in a community-wide incentive campaign, writing down the license plate numbers of persons they observed wearing safety belts and handing out small prizes and materials. Tulsa police stopped young drivers who were buckled up and issued them "safe driver citations."

North Plainfield police operated a B.E.L.T.S. Program (Buckle Every Little Tot Safely) in which police officers in patrol vehicles issued a summons and child safety seat to drivers observed to be transporting a child unsafely. The program in North Plainfield was managed by a 6-member executive committee that included the chief of police, who served as the liaison between the police department and the committee. Other sites with law enforcement representation on task forces included Utah County, Rockland County, Suffolk County, Tulsa, and Bismarck. In Utah County, the police were said to have contributed some of the most consistent and valuable support on the task force (soliciting donations for printing). Other Utah County law enforcement assistance included stopping vehicles and distributing materials during Salem City activities as well as making safety presentations to children in the schools. Still, the evaluation report commented that the program began to work with law enforcement only at the conclusion of the project. Police chiefs in Rockland County regularly met with program staff and provided input. Their departments distributed pamphlets and brochures. Additionally, the program made presentations at the Police Academy and Basic Police Training Schools.

Local police tended to provide some measure of support for safety belt programs. This support could entail assistance with child restraint programs and enforcement of child restraint laws, assistance in conducting community-wide incentive programs, giving presentations or demonstrations using the convincer, or scattered other supportive activities. Law enforcement was represented on a number of task forces.

Public Officials

Support from public officials, where it occurred, tended to be provided at the onset of the program or the onset of major community-wide activities. This support often took the form of attendance at kickoff ceremonies, thereby adding visibility to the program. On occasion, official proclamations supporting belt use were issued. In some communities, municipal employee policies concerning use of restraints were adopted or strengthened.

Municipal officials could be found on several task forces across the 12 model community programs, including North Plainfield (Mayor), Santa Fe (Mayor, City Manager, City Councilman), Utah County (Chairman of Utah County Commission), and Bismarck (Mayor). At some of the sites (Bismarck, Natchitoches), the task force or advisory committee had been formed by the mayor. Information in the reports suggested that the contributions of municipal officials to the programs tended to be advisory in nature.

In Kalamazoo, involvement of public officials was confined largely to their participation in the program kickoff ceremonies. Elsewhere,

hospital. Suffolk County hoped to establish employee programs in all 13 community hospitals. This goal was not achieved, although one hospital did institute a program that consisted of a pre-program observational survey, five presentations, and a pledge card program.

Much of the involvement of the medical community revolved around hospital operation of child seat loaner programs as well as sponsorship of health fairs. Many of the programs were predated by child safety restraint laws, leading to an early emphasis in this area. In addition, various medical facilities established safety belt programs for their employees.

Law Enforcement

Most of the evaluation reports indicated some level of support from law enforcement officials. This support could entail assistance with child restraint programs and enforcement of child restraint laws, assistance in conducting community-wide incentive programs, giving presentations or demonstrations related to safety belt use, or scattered other activities in support of the program. Moreover, it was not uncommon for law enforcement to be represented on the community task forces.

Police were instrumental in running much of the occupant restraint program in Natchitoches. Originally, they were responsible for the law enforcement component of the program which included distribution of information by a special motorcycle patrol, reporting sample observations of restraint use, making presentations to groups, manning displays that included the convincer, and helping to coordinate the infant restraint loaner program at the local parish hospital. The resignation of the Community Involvement Coordinator during the second year of the contract resulted in the Law Enforcement Coordinator assuming total responsibility for the program, thereby taking over all community involvement activities.

Other reports showed the police less involved in orchestrating programs, instead giving their cooperation and support to program activities. Jackson police assisted with the child passenger safety aspects of the project (issued warning cards developed by the project), gave demonstrations at public awareness events (operated a convincer, exhibited a demolished car), were featured on billboards with buckle up messages, and helped to promote community-wide incentive programs (put stickers on vehicles, involved in kickoff ceremonies). In Skagit County, the police stopped vehicles to distribute coupons and informational materials during the major community-wide incentive program. Police in Santa Fe also became involved in a community-wide incentive campaign, writing down the license plate numbers of persons they observed wearing safety belts and handing out small prizes and materials. Tulsa police stopped young drivers who were buckled up and issued them "safe driver citations."

North Plainfield police operated a B.E.L.T.S. Program (Buckle Every Little Tot Safely) in which police officers in patrol vehicles issued a summons and child safety seat to drivers observed to be transporting a child unsafely. The program in North Plainfield was managed by a 6-member executive committee that included the chief of police, who served as the liaison between the police department and the committee. Other sites with law enforcement representation on task forces included Utah County, Rockland County, Suffolk County, Tulsa, and Bismarck. In Utah County, the police were said to have contributed some of the most consistent and valuable support on the task force (soliciting donations for printing). Other Utah County law enforcement assistance included stopping vehicles and distributing materials during Salem City activities as well as making safety presentations to children in the schools. Still, the evaluation report commented that the program began to work with law enforcement only at the conclusion of the project. Police chiefs in Rockland County regularly met with program staff and provided input. Their departments distributed pamphlets and brochures. Additionally, the program made presentations at the Police Academy and Basic Police Training Schools.

Local police tended to provide some measure of support for safety belt programs. This support could entail assistance with child restraint programs and enforcement of child restraint laws, assistance in conducting community-wide incentive programs, giving presentations or demonstrations using the convincer, or scattered other supportive activities. Law enforcement was represented on a number of task forces.

Public Officials

Support from public officials, where it occurred, tended to be provided at the onset of the program or the onset of major community-wide activities. This support often took the form of attendance at kickoff ceremonies, thereby adding visibility to the program. On occasion, official proclamations supporting belt use were issued. In some communities, municipal employee policies concerning use of restraints were adopted or strengthened.

Municipal officials could be found on several task forces across the 12 model community programs, including North Plainfield (Mayor), Santa Fe (Mayor, City Manager, City Councilman), Utah County (Chairman of Utah County Commission), and Bismarck (Mayor). At some of the sites (Bismarck, Natchitoches), the task force or advisory committee had been formed by the mayor. Information in the reports suggested that the contributions of municipal officials to the programs tended to be advisory in nature.

In Kalamazoo, involvement of public officials was confined largely to their participation in the program kickoff ceremonies. Elsewhere,

Jackson public officials made appearances at kickoff ceremonies for each of the community-wide incentive programs that were implemented, with the mayor's office twice issuing proclamations covering promotion periods. Similarly, the Skagit County program obtained a kickoff proclamation signed by county commissioners and city mayors for the All Skagit Buckle Up campaign. Participation of municipal leaders in this county-wide campaign was present from the initial planning stage through program implementation.

The Santa Fe mayor established a Safety belt Challenge promotion that became popular nationwide. The mayor challenged cities with populations over 15,000 to participate in an annual safety belt competition that awarded trophies to:

- The city with the highest percentage of drivers wearing safety belts;
- The city with the highest increased percentage of drivers wearing safety belts; and
- The city with the largest number of persons who begin to wear safety belts.

A fourth category was subsequently created for communities with mandatory laws. The Challenge was supported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration.

A large part of the perceived success of the Suffolk County program was attributed to the strong commitment of the County Executive. Since taking office, this official had worked to improve highway safety--instructing the County Police to fully enforce the drinking and driving laws as well as proposing at the end of 1982 a mandatory safety belt law for County residents. Public attitudes suggested to the County Executive that an educational program was needed, which led the County to solicit and obtain funds for the community safety belt program. The program was run by a full time coordinator located in the County Executive's office. The County Executive appointed a Task Force, enacted a county policy requiring employees to wear safety belts, endorsed the program's county employees program, attended press conferences, spoke at seminars, sent out letters, and engaged in various other activities in support of the program.

The Skagit County evaluation report stated that six cities adopted safety restraint policies for their employees as a result of the All Skagit Buckle Up program. Regarding other sites, a Corporate Safety Belt Conference in Utah County led to approval by the Utah County Commission of a safety belt policy for all county employees driving county vehicles. The San Antonio program mentioned a two-week pledge program in the City's defensive driving course as well as steps taken by the City to modify regulations in its employee handbook. Lobbying of the Natchitoches mayor (the project director) to institute a mandatory use policy for town employees resulted instead in the mayor recommending (and the town

council adopting) a policy encouraging safety belt use. A media campaign plus lobbying by officials in Tulsa culminated with a mandatory safety belt policy for city employees.

Enactment in Suffolk County (February 1984) and Rockland County (June 1984) of employee safety belt usage policies were termed the first elements in the county employees programs of those two community projects. Other elements in the Suffolk County Employees Program were a face-to-face education program (film, slides, pledge cards, incentives, pamphlets, stickers, keychains), surveys of employee belt use, a defensive driving program, and an orientation program for new employees. The Rockland County program included the distribution of bumper stickers, brochures, paycheck stuffers, and decals.

One of the major impediments associated with the Utah County project was the number of municipalities (over 20) located in the original target area. This meant having to work with over 20 mayors, law enforcement agencies, county commissioners, etc.; and would have led to individual programs being established all across the county if this tact was pursued. The project found this unrealistic and subsequently agreed with NHTSA and state personnel to concentrate on Provo while allowing a filter effect to outlying communities. Along the same vein, the Jackson project experienced some difficulties in getting into the school curricula because of the large numbers of children in private schools. As in Utah County, there wasn't a single source (i.e., Public School Board of Education) that could administer program activities to the full targeted population.

For many of the communities, support by public officials occurred primarily through appearances at kickoff ceremonies, where they helped to increase the visibility of the campaigns. Municipal officials also could be found on several task forces. However, their participation tended to be advisory in nature. Still, a few communities reported major exceptions to the low level of individual involvement by public officials. Moreover, several municipal governments instituted employee policies or programs in response to the community programs. Some programs encountered difficulties because the regions they covered included multiple municipalities, which meant having to work with many more persons and setting up more individual programs than was feasible. This was counteracted by concentrating program efforts in the more populous areas.

Table B-5: LOCAL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE

Site	Community Assistance With Program	General Continuity of Assistance
	(Specific Community Segments)	(Ongoing) (Intermittent)
Natchitoches, LA	<p>Police: responsible for running much of the program; made presentations, appeared on media, gave out information, lobbied.</p> <p>Medical: local hospital operated an infant restraint loaner program with assistance from program; sponsored health fairs.</p> <p>Businesses: Several merchants provided donation for incentives.</p> <p>Local Officials: the mayor was the project director.</p> <p>Media: assisted with incentive program.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Intermittent</p> <p>Intermittent</p>
Kalamazoo, MI	<p>Businesses: donated prizes and distributed decals for single incentive campaign.</p> <p>Medical: family physicians received information packets for distribution; hospitals had health fairs; other unspecified.</p> <p>Local Officials: attended initial ceremony to show support.</p> <p>Volunteers: came from the general segment of the community starting with the Red Cross, hospitals, and committee members.</p>	<p>Kickoff</p> <p>Intermittent</p> <p>Kickoff</p> <p>Ongoing for small core of volunteers</p>
Jackson, MS	<p>Media: ongoing coverage and sponsorship of activities.</p> <p>Police: assisted with child passenger aspects of project, demonstrated the convincer, featured in messages on billboards, put stickers on vehicles.</p> <p>Businesses: sponsored and made donations for incentive programs, established encouragement and mandatory use policies and programs for employees.</p> <p>Public Officials: attended kickoff ceremonies, issued proclamation.</p> <p>Civic Organizations: assisted with activities and sponsored programs</p> <p>Celebrities: PSA spot recorded by singing group Alabama.</p> <p>Sports: PSA filmed by catcher on local baseball team.</p> <p>Educators: cooperated with program activities, provided some in-house education.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Intermittent</p> <p>(?)</p> <p>One Time</p> <p>One Time</p> <p>(?)</p>

Table B-5: LOCAL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE (cont.)

Site	Community Assistance With Program	General Continuity of Assistance
	(Specific Community Segments)	(Ongoing) (Intermittent)
North Plainfield, NJ	<p>Network system: local fire, police, rescue squad, hospital and schools. Also medical associations, civic organizations, business groups and media.</p> <p>Law enforcement: BELTS program issued summons and child safety seat to drivers of vehicles not transporting child safely, made presentations.</p>	<p>Intermittent</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
Santa Fe, NM	<p>Businesses: made donations and assisted with incentive campaign.</p> <p>Law Enforcement: assisted with the incentive campaign.</p> <p>Students: high school students assisted with the incentive campaign.</p>	
Rockland County, NY	<p>County government: instituted policy for employees, disseminated literature, bumper stickers</p> <p>Hospitals: Disseminated information and literature put up posters and signs, articles in publications, health fair.</p> <p>Employers: initiated programs.</p> <p>Schools: Distributed materials, conducted safety belt awareness sessions.</p> <p>Car dealer association: developed customer program.</p> <p>Law enforcement: distributed brochures, book covers, pamphlet regular input by police chiefs.</p> <p>McDonalds: distributed brochures.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Intermittent</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

Table B-5: LOCAL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE (cont.)

Site	Community Assistance With Program	General Continuity of Assistance
	(Specific Community Segments)	(Ongoing) (Intermittent)
Suffolk County, NY	County Executive Police/Highway Patrol State Dept of Criminal Justice County Health Dept. County Medical Society Local university Radio stations	Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing Intermittent Ongoing
Bismark, ND	Businesses: donated prizes, distributed information. State Employees: Incentive program for state employees. Volunteers: Distributed information packets, incentive tokens.	Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing
Tulsa, OK	Local hospital Local employers	Ongoing Intermittent
San Antonio, TX	Media: provided information; helped to publicize events. Businesses: established programs and policies for employees; helped to sponsor events. Educators: cooperated with program and conducted activities in the schools; PTA obtained migrant and sponsored school programs and events. City Government: implemented pledge program in defensive driving course; took steps to modify employee handbook. Police: set up displays; held workshops; other.	Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing Intermittent Intermittent

Program Characteristics

The individual programs differed in how the communities promoted their programs in the local community. This section summarizes how the projects were initiated and the types of activities that occurred over the course of the programs. Specific cross site comparisons of the special events are listed in Table B-6.

Kickoffs

Several of the project reports referred to "hoopla" or publicity used to initiate the program or major program activities. The Kalamazoo project kicked off its activities with a special luncheon attended by prominent community leaders and national celebrities. This event launched a week long promotion centered around the theme "We Love You Buckle Up." A four week community-wide incentive program also was begun at this time.

Utah County held an occupant protection conference as its kickoff event. The conference, which was designed to solicit support from key community members, included presentations along with displays. Themes covered were:

- What a community can do to promote occupant protection;
- The role of occupant restraints in prevention of injury and death;
- Safety restraint education in the schools and business sector.

The Bismarck project began its activities with a kickoff breakfast covered by print and electronic media. A local disc jockey acted as master of ceremonies.

The Jackson program generated a large measure of publicity at the beginning of each of its community-wide incentive programs. Typically, news conferences utilizing prominent community leaders were held, proclamations were made, and extensive media coverage was provided. For the launching of its Beltmobile, the program displayed the vehicle at a shopping mall where free prizes were given out, safety films were shown, and radio disc jockeys made live broadcasts. The event was preceded by one full week of radio promotion as well as newspaper advertising.

The San Antonio program kicked off its activities with a press conference held in an area known as the "Death Loop," using this as a way to emphasize the need for driver safety. Other major program events received heavy media coverage at their inception.

Large amounts of hoopla and publicity were used to initiate programs and launch major activities. This created media interest and also helped to draw in volunteers.

Logos/Mascots

Various programs developed logos or created mascots to provide identities to their campaigns. The program symbol of the Bismarck project was a stuffed egg wearing a cowboy hat and boots. Named BUB (Buckle Up Bismarck, the project slogan), the character was used extensively to reach children as well as approach adults. It became so popular that it was adopted as a statewide character, becoming Buckle Up Buddy.

Utah County selected as a slogan for its program "Buckle Up Utah County." The acronym BUUC also served as the name for the program mascot, a cowboy wearing a brilliant yellow shirt with a plaid yoke, blue jeans, blue scarf, and boots. BUUC appeared at promotional activities such as fairs, parades, and school presentations. The San Antonio program tried out a mascot called Buckie, which was a high school girl wearing a costume shaped like a large red heart with safety belts around the center. Buckie appeared in one parade where she handed out buttons along the parade route. Afterwards, it was decided to discontinue the Buckie character as "just walking alone in a parade does not convey much of an obvious safety belt message except through materials handed out to the crowds."

The trademark of the Model Safety Community in North Plainfield came from a safety logo that had been designed by the program and applied to all outgoing mail. The logo displayed three messages - Safety Belts Work, Buckle-Up, and North Plainfield-A Model Safety Community. In Kalamazoo, safety belt task force members selected "We Love You, Buckle Up" as the theme for its kickoff promotion. The Jackson project employed "Make It Click!" and "Get It Together" promotions for its incentive campaigns.

Programs developed logos and mascots to provide identities to their campaigns. The mascots became well-known reminders of the safety belt program, as well as another tool for approaching various segments of the community.

Program Diversity

The model community programs varied in the levels of diversity employed to reach target populations. Speaking engagements, display booths at community events, news releases, and some level of media coverage tended to be found across the board. Most of the sites also conducted some form of incentive campaign(s). Past these activities, some programs recorded a paucity of events whereas others, such as Jackson and Utah County, displayed a richness in methods.

The Jackson program utilized a variety of both passive and active methods to attract attention to its message. Passive methods included banners used on busy downtown streets, messages on strategically placed

billboards, advertising on public benches, mottos displayed on business message boards, and updated traffic accident reports on a sign in front of police headquarters. More important were the steps taken to draw in members of the community. The project twice sent letters to more than 200 businesses and manufacturers; the first time offering assistance in developing programs and policies (with a survey form enclosed) and the second time providing detailed information on how to establish a safety belt policy. Several hundred businesses and organizations also were exposed to a full page article on the need for safety belt policies printed in the Mississippi Safety Council Newsletter. Another business-related feature was a Corporate Workshop held for 50 corporate executives which explained the monetary benefits of corporate safety belt policies.

School activities conducted by the Jackson project included a safety belt competition among seven high schools, a contest for young children that involved photographs of them wearing safety belts or sitting in child restraints, and banquets/programs for the Mayor's Youth Council. In the area of child passenger safety, the project supplied law enforcement officers with warning cards (Child Restraint Law) for dispersal to the public, helped to increase child seat inventories of various loaner programs, provided advice on starting and running loaner programs, and conducted an educational program for kindergarten and private nursery school children. Community-wide, the project engaged in a series of high visibility incentive campaigns, launching each with a great deal of fanfare. One of these campaigns involved the introduction of a Beltmobile onto the streets of the city, a publicity tool that later was adopted by other municipalities. Overall, media coverage was ongoing, with a broad mix of both informational and activities-related messages.

Kickoff of the Utah County project occurred through an occupant protection conference that was used both to announce the program as well as solicit community support. Later activities listed in the evaluation report included those that involved the dissemination of information by intermediaries:

- Safety belt and car seat information became a part of the curricula for first aid and safety instructorship classes at the Provo City Red Cross.
- Safety belt information was included in the education and behavior change workshop of an ongoing health risk assessment program.
- Cards explaining Utah's child restraint law were attached to birth certificate worksheets by hospitals.
- Safety belt curriculum packets were distributed to local church units for dissemination.

- Safety belt information kits were provided to Provo Girl Scouts to distribute to families not having elementary age children, with the girl scouts also explaining to them the benefits of safety belt use.
- Packets were provided to Cub Scout packs for instruction of Cub Scouts.
- Elementary school children were issued "Save Your Family" kits that they were to take home with them. The children were asked to present to their families a message on safety restraint use as well as lead them in an activity of locating safety belts buried in family cars and getting them ready for use. The parents signed pledge cards that the children returned to the schools for candy prizes.

Besides the Save Your Family campaign, other Utah County school activities included a coloring contest for elementary and mentally handicapped students plus a safety belt incentive program for high school students. One of the more important employer efforts was a Corporate Seat Belt Conference (a luncheon) where CEOs and personnel directors received information and participated in a sample pledge and incentive activity. Other methods employed by the project to reach the public were messages on digital display signs donated by local merchants, a newsletter that highlighted a local employee incentive program, parade entries at local events, and a community-wide incentive program.

Some of the evaluation reports listed what the projects considered to be their most effective activities. In Utah County, these "included 'Save Your Family Kits' targeting elementary age students, the establishment of corporate and high school safety belt education/incentive programs, the development and distribution of a church curriculum promoting safety belt use, and a variety of media campaigns targeting the general population."

The author of the Natchitoches evaluation report considered the most effective activity of the Law Enforcement Component of the program to be the use of a special motorcycle patrol. This patrol stopped all traffic law violators, issued tickets or warnings, and distributed information about occupant restraint use to all persons stopped. Other activities rated effective or successful were shopping center displays that included the convincer, a radio incentive program employing saturation techniques, and presentations to community groups. The report further stated that the most successful activities engaged in by the Community Involvement Coordinator were "the contacts made through manning an office to reply to requests for materials, and the weekly writing of a newspaper column promoting restraint use."

Evaluators of the Bismarck project believed that the BUB promotional character was the main driving force behind the program's perceived success. Young children were very receptive to the character. Moreover, the project found most adults easier to reach using BUB. The character

caused people to stop and take notice. It became well known and popular during the course of the project and its use was subsequently expanded statewide.

The coordinator of the Suffolk County project attributed the perceived success of the program to three factors: the leadership and commitment of the County Executive, their capitalizing on the timing of the State Safety Belt Law, and the support of community leaders on the Task Force. School activities were considered the most successful component of the program (see Schools section). The corporate and medical components were rated the least effective. The coordinator claimed that the lack of success in these areas resulted from insufficient follow-up; there simply were not enough volunteers in these community segments to do all the work that the project wanted.

Programs differed in the diversity of their methods. Speaking engagements, display booths, news releases, and some level of media coverage occurred across all sites. Some programs did little more than these activities while others showed a richness of methods that may have included special events and contests, letters or surveys sent to targeted community segments, use of others to provide instruction on safety belts, or incorporation of safety belt information in curricula of Red Cross or other community safety courses. Programs also varied in the types of activities they considered to be their most effective, again suggesting that the important factor is not what is done but rather how it is done.

Ongoing Community-Wide Incentives

Community-wide incentive campaigns were infrequent (or nonexistent) within some programs while ongoing in others. The Kalamazoo project implemented a 4-week community-wide incentive program at the start of its program, but did not repeat it during the remainder of the contract. The only other major community-wide event involving incentives mentioned in the Kalamazoo report was a county fair where various activities were conducted over a span of six days. Conversely, the Skagit County public incentive program was instituted near the end of that project's second year.

The Jackson project made a concerted effort to provide incentive promotions on a continuing basis. Innovative programs such as these were deemed necessary to create media interest and draw other local support. Moreover, early incentive programs implemented by the project had been followed by increases in safety belt usage rates. It was felt that a continued incentive push was needed to keep the rates from dropping. To this end, the project introduced a Beltmobile to the streets of Jackson. The vehicle was used continually during the duration of the program dispensing incentive awards on a daily basis. The Beltmobile also was featured prominently at local events and participated in variou

community activities.

Community-wide incentive programs were infrequent or non-existent in some programs while ongoing in others. Ongoing programs were a way of maintaining media attention and community interest in the project.

Table B-6: SPECIAL PROGRAM SPONSORED EVENTS

Site	Special Program-Sponsored Events or Campaigns	Awards Used For Incentives	Regularity of Incentive Giveaways
	(Type)	(Type)	(Ongoing) (Occasional) (Never)
Natchitoches, LA	Incentive Program	Food Coupons Trip (Grand Prize)	Ongoing Year 1: May-Sept84 Year 2:
Kalamazoo, MI	Kickoff Week Incentive Program	Pizzas Theater Tickets Get-Away Weekend	Single Event (4 weeks)
	County Fair Event	Free Rides/Events	Single Event (6 days)
Jackson, MS	Incentive Programs (Several, including the Beltmobile)	T-shirts Food Coupons Automobiles Cash Prizes Trips Coke products Newspapers Key Chains Suckers Tickets	Ongoing
	High School Seat Belt Competition	School Trophy School Plaque Key Chains Stickers Lollipops	Single Event (one month)
North Plainfield, NJ	Incentive Program Direct awards Raffle with license number	Gift Certificate Key chains TV set Balloons	Run over a short period.
	BELTS program where police issue summons and child seat if child not restrained.		Ongoing
	Poster contest	Gift Certificate	Single Event
	Convincer Day	Free Breakfasts	Single Event
Santa Fe, NM	Community Incentive Campaign	Dinners Trip	
	National Seat Belt Challenge	Trophy	Ongoing

Table B-6: SPECIAL PROGRAM SPONSORED EVENTS (cont.)

Site	Special Program-Sponsored Events or Campaigns	Awards Used For Incentives	Regularity of Incentive Giveaways
	(Type)	(Type)	(Ongoing) (Occasional) (Never)
Rockland County, NY	None		
Suffolk County, NY	None		
Bismark, ND	Displays at Malls Presentations to school-age children Buckle Up Bismark (BUB) State Fair Incentive Programs	Pizza Coupons Theatre Tickets BUB lapel pin Donut holes Badge Food coupons Auto Service Stickers Post cards Pamphlets TV sets Microwave Ovens Dishware Fire Extinguisher Money	Occasional Occasional Ongoing
Tulsa, OK	Student Incentives Flintmobile mall demonstration	\$1,000 Bond	Occasional
San Antonio, TX	Kickoff Event CEO Challenge for employers High School Challenge programs Poster Contests Project Graduation Community Incentive Campaign	Trophies Certificates Cash Awards T-shirts	Once Each Year Once Each Year Once Each Year

Table B-6: SPECIAL PROGRAM SPONSORED EVENTS (cont.)

Site	Special Program-Sponsored Events or Campaigns	Awards Used For Incentives	Regularity of Incentive Giveaways
	(Type)	(Type)	(Ongoing) (Occasional) (Never)
Utah County, UT	Kickoff Occupant Protection Conference		Kickoff
	Education campaign for Salem City	Coupons Car Seat Candy Kites	Single time (one-week length)
	Radio/Incentive Campaign	Soft Drinks Food Prizes Movie Passes Blank Video Tapes T-shirts VCR Portable TV Ski Parkas Luxury Hotel Stay	Single Event (one month)
	Save Your Family campaign for elementary pupils	Candy Food Coupons	Single Event (One Week)
	Coloring Contest for elementary pupils and mentally handicapped.	Coke Products Bicycle	Single Event (one month)
	Incentive Campaign for High Schools	Food Coupons Muffins Video Movie Passes Pencils Stickers Litter Bags	Single Event (About One Month)
	All-American Buckle-Up Week Activities	Stickers Posters Materials	Annually

Table B-6: SPECIAL PROGRAM SPONSORED EVENTS (cont.)

Site	Special Program-Sponsored Events or Campaigns	Awards Used For Incentives	Regularity of Incentive Giveaways
	(Type)	(Type)	(Ongoing) (Occasional) (Never)
Skagit County, WA	Valentine Program for children	Valentines Stickers Buckle Up Report Cards Coloring Pages	Annually
	Poster Contests for children		Twice
	Traffic Safety Awareness Week	Recognition Ceremony	Single Event
	Essay Contest for students		Single Event
	All Skagit Buckle Up campaign	Fast Food Coupons	Single Event (3 weeks)

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Observation Data

The contracts between NHTSA and the model programs paid for the collection and compilation of observation data of occupant restraint usage within the model communities. Typically there was a baseline observation prior to program implementation, two or more observations during the course of the program, and a final observation at the completion of the contract. A summary of the observation data for drivers are presented in Table B-7. The enactment date of mandatory use laws are indicated by EEE's, effective date of the law by FFF's, and effective date of fines by \$\$\$'s.

A key limitation in comparing a community's baseline data to later observations is that some sites altered their methodologies over time. For example, Utah County initially conducted observations at county gas stations of all passengers in the vehicle. At NHTSA's insistence, this was changed to observations of front seat passengers only at intersections. Observations also were restricted to the Provo area. The first interim observation in Utah County included both methodologies while later observations used the new methodology exclusively.

Elsewhere, the Jackson materials showed the baseline and other early observation figures being computed from 10 sites. Later observation figures were based on 16 sites. Variation in numbers of sites across observations also occurred in North Plainfield. In Tulsa, a statewide safety belt observation study caused the program to reduce by more than one-third the number of vehicles included during the latter observation waves so that Tulsa's count was proportionate to its percentage of the population. The Bismarck report noted that some observations occurred during inclement weather, which meant that observers could not record data on vehicles without shoulder straps. The Skagit County program made changes in sites, days, and time of day after the baseline observation in order to obtain the demographic composition desired. The San Antonio program also switched some sites. Moreover, some skewing occurred in the baseline readings because of observations made on a national holiday.

Difficulties also arise when attempting to make comparisons of usage rates across sites because of variations in methodology as well as regional differences. Programs generally had observers surveying vehicles at intersections, although the Utah County project initially established sites at service stations and the Natchitoches project observed cars crossing local bridges. Numbers of observation sites differed substantially across programs, as did the rough number of observations made. Observers could be students, police, volunteers, or persons hired to perform the counts. It was standard practice for the programs to provide training to these individuals before sending them out. Observers for some programs were told to survey drivers only, other programs included passengers and/or young children (infant and toddler safety seat usage). Observers were instructed as to which vehicles to sample and whether they should look for shoulder belts only or lap belts.

Sites also differed in the duration of observation waves, as well as the time of year, days of the week, and time of day during which observations were made. Some programs used a systematic approach to selecting sites such that a representative sample of the entire community (or a sample weighted according to some desired variable) was obtained. Other programs chose sites based on high traffic flow density.

Regional factors that may influence safety belt usage rates include population density, population characteristics, climate, and topography. State mandatory usage laws seemed to have a strong impact on usage rates. Consequently it's difficult to compare sites without taking into account the relative status of proposed and enacted mandatory use legislation.

Attitudinal Surveys

Community-wide knowledge and attitudinal surveys were conducted by most, but not all, of the model programs that were reviewed:

Natchitoches: No indication of a community-wide survey; conducted a survey of parents of students who attended Beltman classes.

Kalamazoo: Telephone surveys of the community conducted in February 1984 and Fall 1985.

Jackson: Telephone surveys of the community were conducted in August 1984 and October 1985.

North Plainfield: No indication of a community-wide survey.

Santa Fe: Three waves of knowledge and attitude surveys were conducted in which drivers were randomly selected and queried.

Rockland County: No indication of a community-wide survey.

Suffolk County: Telephone surveys of the community were conducted in October 1983 and October 1984.

Bismarck: Mailed surveys of the community were conducted in February 1984 and September 1985.

Tulsa: A telephone survey of licensed drivers in the community was conducted in Fall 1984; also surveyed key persons and Tulsa Coalition members.

San Antonio: No indication of a community-wide survey.

Utah County: Two telephone surveys of the community were conducted.

Skagit County: No indication of a community-wide survey; surveys were conducted at schools, mailed to physicians, and mailed to preschools and licensed day care homes.

GENERAL SUMMARY

The 12 model community programs shared many of the same characteristics. The programs typically involved presentations to groups, display booths at community events, incentive campaigns, media coverage, and surveys of community safety belt usage. Presentations occurred more frequently before school audiences than any other specific group. Radio tended to be more active than the other major media in providing coverage/information and sponsoring events. While all sites showed some increase in safety belt use during the course of their programs, the sharpest jumps occurred after enactment of state safety belt use laws.

The leadership provided by the program coordinator was crucial to program effectiveness. The key demand placed on coordinators was to bring their safety message to the forefront of community awareness through a volunteer-based comprehensive community program. This required a certain aggressiveness on their part, mixed with a general facility in dealing with people and skill at deploying resources to the greatest advantage. Programs encountered difficulties in meeting overall objectives when coordinators concentrated their efforts only on those program segments with which they felt most comfortable or adept. Additionally, there were suggestions that some programs could have accomplished more if their coordinators had been more proficient at delegating tasks, rather than taking on everything themselves. However, the coordinators simply might not have had anyone available to whom they could delegate.

Volunteer task forces provided links between the program and the community. Programs often found that task force members considered their role to be advisory in nature, without any responsibilities for active participation. Even where task forces were considered active, there tended to be a small core of persons who did all the work. This suggests that coordinators need to communicate explicit expectations concerning task force responsibilities right from the start. Programs used task force members as conduits to their respective organizations. They were likely to benefit from including a broad spectrum of the community on the task force. Bringing in new members during the course of the program may also benefit programs by adding new perspectives and avenues of access.

Programs tended to set goals for themselves, many of which were stated in general terms. Whether goals were attained depended in large measure on how realistic they were.

Media coverage involved informational messages as well as communication of program activities. Media at various sites

also involved themselves in the conduct of certain promotional events. The predilection of media to cover only what it considers "newsworthy" caused some problems for programs in maintaining media exposure. Keeping the program in the public eye may well depend on the ability to adapt the program to the events-oriented nature of the media. Media involvement in specific activities may also help to encourage longer term support.

Employers provided support by donating prizes for incentive programs, volunteering resources, and distributing materials. Many also established policies and set up programs for their employees. Special initiatives such as corporate workshops or conferences seemed particularly effective in generating employee programs.

Many of the projects found school officials cooperative in setting up presentations/programs in the schools and distributing materials. Several PTAs were highly active in school safety belt programs.

Much of the involvement of the medical community revolved around hospital operation of child seat loaner programs as well as sponsorship of health fairs. Many of the programs were predated by child safety restraint laws, leading to an early emphasis in this area. In addition, various medical facilities established safety belt programs for their employees.

Local police tended to provide some measure of support for safety belt programs. This support could entail assistance with child restraint programs and enforcement of child restraint laws, assistance in conducting community-wide incentive programs, giving presentations or demonstrations using the convincer, or scattered other supportive activities. Law enforcement was represented on a number of task forces.

For many of the communities, support by public officials occurred primarily through appearances at kickoff ceremonies, where they helped to increase the visibility of the campaigns. Municipal officials also could be found on several task forces. However, their participation tended to be advisory in nature. Still, a few communities reported major exceptions to the low level of individual involvement by public officials. Moreover, several municipal governments instituted employee policies or programs in response to the community programs. Some programs encountered difficulties because the regions they covered included multiple municipalities, which meant having to work with many more persons and setting up more individual programs than was feasible. This was counteracted by concentrating program efforts in the more populous areas.

Large amounts of hoopla and publicity were used to initiate

programs and launch major activities. This created media interest and also helped to draw in volunteers.

Programs developed logos and mascots to provide identities to their campaigns. The mascots became well-known reminders of the safety belt program, as well as another tool for approaching various segments of the community.

Programs differed in the diversity of their methods. Speaking engagements, display booths, news releases, and some level of media coverage occurred across all sites. Some programs did little more than these activities while others showed a richness of methods that may have included special events and contests, letters or surveys sent to targeted community segments, use of others to provide instruction on safety belts, or incorporation of safety belt information in curricula of Red Cross or other community safety courses. Programs also varied in the types of activities they considered to be their most effective, again suggesting that the important factor is not what is done but rather how it is done.

Community-wide incentive programs were infrequent or non-existent in some programs while ongoing in others. Ongoing programs were a way of maintaining media attention and community interest in the project.

EXHIBIT B-1: NATCHITOCHEs, LOUISIANA

Population: 18,635 (1985)

Program Period: 10/83 - 10/85

State SBUL: Enacted 7/85; Effective 7/86; Fine Effective 8/86

Fine: \$25 Enforcement: Secondary

City Infant Restraint Use Ordinance Enacted: 4/81

Program Dimensions: (1) Law Enforcement Component (LEC)

(2) Community Involvement Component (CIC)

MEDIA

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>RADIO</u>	
Appearances by law enforcement coordinator on early morning talk shows. (LEC)	At least once each week. estimated audience over 10,000.
Radio station sponsorship of incentive programs for belt use. (LEC)	Second year: an estimated \$2,000 in prize donations, over 100 persons received incentive awards.
<u>TV</u>	
Appearances by officers on TV programs sponsored by the nearest TV station. (LEC)	Several occasions.
Public service announcements. (LEC)	No number reported.
<u>NEWSPAPER</u>	
Stories on program events. (LEC)	Several articles (fewer events were covered than expected).
Articles on restraint use for the local paper. (CIC)	Weekly.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>COALITIONS</u>	
A citizen's advisory committee was selected to help manage the community involvement program. (CIC)	Monthly breakfast meetings were held. The community involvement coordinator was unable to secure volunteer assistance from the group.

NATCHITOCHEs, LOUISIANA

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

Police: Several officers were responsible for running much of the program. Others contributed their time to activities.

Multiple LEC activities. Police officers took over CIC activities during the program's last six months.

Media: Promotions and communication of information.

See media above.

Local businesses: Made donations for safety belt use incentive programs.

Several merchants. See radio promotion above.

Local hospital: Worked with police on the infant restraint loaner program.

Hospital displays, brochures given to new parents, personal visit by a volunteer aid. Thirty-six usable restraints at the end of the first year.

Politicians: The mayor was the project director.

Little information on level of assistance.

SOLICITATION OF ASSISTANCE

The community involvement coordinator publicized a safety belt office phone number. (CIC)

Never maintained a list of activities that could be assigned to callers. Considered ineffective.

Lobbying

The law enforcement coordinator visited several businesses and industries. Also appealed to the mayor for a use policy for the town. (LEC)

Three of the businesses implemented use policies. The mayor did not recommend to the city council a mandatory use policy for city employees but instead recommended (and the council adopted) a policy encouraging safety belt use. Indirectly, these use policies affected about 300 drivers.

Officers attended state meetings to promote safety belt use and participated in legislative lobbying for state safety belt laws. (LEC)

No information on frequency of lobbying.

NATCHITOCHEs, LOUISIANA

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

Special motorcycle patrol (two officers) distributed materials to persons stopped for traffic violations. (LEC)

1692 drivers were ticketed for violations and at least 1,000 more stopped during the two program years.

The community involvement coordinator supplied materials to various organizations.(CIC)

No numbers given.

PRESENTATIONS

The law enforcement coordinator and two patrol officers made speeches, showed films, and distributed materials (including novelty items)to various groups. (LEC)

Ninety-five presentations were made to community groups averaging 25 persons per audience, for an estimated total of 2375 persons.

The police department conducted open house tours where the law enforcement coordinator talked to visitors and distributed materials encouraging safety belt use. (LEC)

The visits occurred an average of once a month, with an average of 15 persons in each group, for a total of about 360 persons.

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

The three officers manned shopping center displays where they used the convincer and distributed materials. (LEC)

Eleven displays were conducted, reaching an estimated 3300 people.

The community involvement coordinator manned displays at health fairs sponsored by the hospital. (CIC)

An estimated 400 visitors to these fairs during the two years.

CLASSROOM PRESENTATIONS

Police officers taught Beltman classes in the schools. (LEC)

About 495 second graders were reached.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS

Incentive programs were conducted where spotters called in license numbers to a radio sponsor. It was considered more effective during the second year, after the reporting procedure was simplified and the number of spots and prizes increased to the saturation level.

About \$2,000 in merchant prizes were donated in the second year, with over 100 people receiving incentive awards.

NATCHITOCHEs, LOUISIANA

EVALUATION MEASURES

(Baseline)

	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
<u>ACCIDENTS</u>			
Total Citywide Accidents	615	592	537
Percent Restraint Use By:			
Drivers	3.5%	4.5%	14.6%
Infants	14.4%	22.0%	59.3%
Other Passengers	3.2%	5.3%	18.2%
Percent of Citywide Accidents in Special Patrol Zones:			
During All Hours	35%	42%	43%
During Patrol Hours	49%	47%	45%
<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>			
Numbers of Drivers Observed	4319	3980	5160
Percent Using Restraints	6.7%	7.4%	9.5%
Numbers of Infants Observed	144	144	227
Percent Using Restraints	31.5%	53.5%	79.4%
Other Passengers Observed	1200	1010	1302
Percent Using Restraints	7.7%	8.3%	8.9%

TASK COMPLETION

All tasks specified for the Law Enforcement Component were attained. The majority of tasks specified for the Community Involvement Component were not accomplished.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The evaluation report attributed problems in gaining community participation and carrying out planned tasks to the failure of the Community Involvement Coordinator (CIC) to assume a leadership role. Rather than being an aggressive proponent of safety belt use, the CIC preoccupied herself with many low profile tasks while avoiding situations where she would be a focus of attention. She did not initiate contacts with segments of the community with which she felt uncomfortable and failed to develop new approaches to enlisting businesses after initial rejections. Even when groups or individuals in the community volunteered their services, the CIC was unable to assign tasks to them.

Officers conducting the Law Enforcement Component were under the impression that planning and implementing activities with the lay public were supposed to be done by the Community Involvement Coordinator. During the first year and a half of the program they responded to her initiatives. After the CIC resigned, the officers took charge and implemented community involvement activities.

NATCHITOCHEs, LOUISIANA

EXHIBIT B-2: KALAMAZOO COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Population: 212,378 (1980)

Program Period: 9/83 - 10/85

State SBUL: Enacted 3/85; Effective 7/85; Fine Effective 7/85

Fine: \$25 Enforcement: Secondary

Program Dimensions: Program started through the Kalamazoo Chapter of the American Red Cross. Public awareness and educational campaigns conducted by a community-based safety belt task force.

MEDIA

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>RADIO AND TV</u> Appearances on radio and TV talk shows by task force members.	Eighteen appearances.
Participation by three radio stations in an incentive program for belt use.	Four-week program with daily prizes and a grand prize.
PSAs on radio.	Six were developed and aired for the county fair. No data on others.
<u>NEWSPAPER</u> Newspaper articles covering task force activities.	Forty-four articles.
Inclusion in accident reports whether individuals were wearing safety belts.	Local newspaper.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>COALITIONS</u> A highly active task force that coordinated and conducted program activities. Special committees dealt with particular areas or segments of the community.	Developed by the Red Cross. Included representatives from both major hospitals, Southwest Michigan EMS, most police departments, the County Road Commission, the State Department of Transportation, EVISD, AAA, the State Driver Improvement Center, and the State Office of Highway Planning.

KALAMAZOO COUNTY, MICHIGAN

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES</u>	
<u>Media:</u> Promotions and communication of information.	See media above.
<u>Local businesses:</u> Donations of prizes for incentive program. Distribution of decals for incentive program.	Four-week promotion during kick-off campaign.
<u>Medical community:</u> Local hospital distributed decals for incentive program. Local medical center cosponsored a "Salute to Safety" party for young children and their parents. Provided games, films, snacks, informational materials, and Beltman.	Four-week promotion during kick-off campaign. One of the activities during the kick-off week of the program.
<u>Celebrities:</u> Appearance of prominent community leaders and national celebrities.	Kick-off ceremony for the safety belt program.
<u>Volunteers:</u> manned displays, surveyed individuals on belt use, and performed other activities.	A total of 481 volunteers supplied 2951 hours of work.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS</u>	
Quarterly newsletter called the "Beltline."	Distributed to local organizations, corporations, community leaders, and interested individuals.
Seasonal press releases and PSAs.	Distributed prior to major holidays.
<u>PRESENTATIONS</u>	
Speaking engagements conducted by the task force.	A total of 103. Approximately 15,666 participants reached.
Saved by the Belt awards.	Twelve given.

KALAMAZOO COUNTY, MICHIGAN

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS</u> Safety belt exhibits and mall displays.	A total of 28. Approximately 20,000 individuals reached.
<u>CLASSROOM PRESENTATIONS</u> Informational presentations to parents of students beginning driver's education.	The task force's education committee hosted a "Parent's Night" at several high schools.
Presentation of films, literature, and "Buckle Up" key chains to students in driver's education classes.	No numbers given.
<u>PRESENTATIONS TO BUSINESSES</u> The task force's corporate committee provided literature, films, and speakers to businesses and corporations upon request.	No data given.
<u>SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS</u> Kick-off campaign for the safety belt program, February 1984.	A week-long promotion included a special luncheon, celebrities, activities, and an incentive program.
Kalamazoo County Fair, August 1984.	Six-day promotion that included a manned educational display, prizes, and a "Saved by the Belt" award. About 190 hours were contributed by staff and 43 volunteers; several thousand people were reached.
A community-wide incentive program where participants applied decals to their cars, wore their safety belts, and listened to the three participating radio stations to hear their license plate number.	A four week campaign begun during the kickoff of the program. Daily prizes were awarded as well as a grand prize drawing.

KALAMAZOO COUNTY, MICHIGAN

EVALUATION MEASURES

	February 1984		Fall 1985		
<u>TELEPHONE SURVEY</u>					
Always Use Safety belts		40.2%		43.8%	
Never Use Safety belts		26.1%		17.9%	
	8/83	5/84	10/84	5/85	9/85
<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>					
Drivers Observed	7144	6276	6700	6650	6241
Wearing Belts	17.7%	18.9%	23.9%	31.1%	58.4%
Front Seat Pass- engers Observed	1751	1429	1478	1611	1310
Wearing Belts	15.4%	14.8%	16.8%	25.9%	48.9%

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

According to the evaluation report, the program maintained high levels of activity during the period under study. Relatively little money was spent when compared to the amounts of time and energy that were invested. After federal funding ended, the task force continued to meet and conduct various promotions and presentations.

During the course of the program, the Kalamazoo Chapter of the Red Cross was awarded first place in the publicity campaign category at the 1985 National Convention of the American Red Cross. The Office of Highway Safety Planning considered the most important ingredient to the program's success to be an "enthusiastic, energetic coordinator or task force chair. Knowledge of the safety belt issues are not as important as the personality of the individual coordinating the program."

This program is serving as a model for other local community projects, with Kalamazoo task force members assisting in the training of project coordinators for the new programs.

EXHIBIT B-3: JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

Population: 214,000 (1980)

Program Period: 12/83 - 11/85

State SBUL: Child Restraint Law Effective 7/83

Program Dimensions: (1) Child Passenger Safety (2) Enforcement Community Involvement (3) Citywide Incentives (4) Evaluative Studies (5) Media Support (6) Community Support (7) Corporate/Employer Programs and Policies (8) Public Information and Education (9) School Activities (10) Outreach.

MEDIA

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>RADIO</u>	
Sponsorship and promotion of citywide incentive programs.	Various stations. Ongoing during the period of study.
Reminders to buckle up at the conclusion of traffic reports.	Daily during rush hours.
Live programs at the Traffic Safety Display set up at the Metrocenter Mall.	The display is set up annually.
PSAs.	All local stations. Different PSAs during the program.
<u>TV</u>	
News special on the Child Restraint Law that also dealt with safety issues such as safety belts.	A 20-minute follow-on to the first annual Traffic Safety Display. Appearance by Task Force member.
PSAs.	The three local TV stations.
News report on the Beltmobile. Reminders from the weatherman of a local station to watch for the Beltmobile.	No numbers given.
<u>NEWSPAPER</u>	
Local newspapers cosponsored the Beltmobile.	Extensive coverage; supplied newspapers for giveaways.
Local coverage: editorials, survey data, survival stories, Metrocenter Traffic Safety Display, Beltmobile, Barbara Mandrell accident, All American Buckle Up, Child Passenger Safety Awareness Day.	No numbers given.

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COALITIONS

A Task Force was formed, and committees selected according to needs--Work Projects, Child Restraints, Safety belt Policy, and Public Awareness.

Members served as conduits of information for their respective organizations. Their time/expertise were constantly used for specific programs.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

MEDIA: Promotions and communication of information.

Heavy involvement of three major media. See above.

POLICE: Operated a convincer and displayed a "totalled" car during special public awareness activities.

No numbers given.

Featured the Police Chief on billboards in Jackson area.

Five billboards urging citizens to buckle up.

Put bumper stickers on police vehicles during first citywide incentive program.

Pre-study period (5/83).

Involved with enforcement of child restraint law.

Police were educated about the law and given warning cards to give to violators.

LOCAL BUSINESSES: Made donations and contributed resources for promotions.

Major involvement in all incentive programs throughout the period under study.

MEDICAL COMMUNITY: Operated child restraint loaner programs.

Most local Jackson hospitals. The project provided information and assistance.

CELEBRITIES: The singing group Alabama recorded two 30-second PSAs at a local radio station.

Tapes were sent to all radio stations in the state. NHTSA received a master copy for national use.

SPORTS: PSA filmed with the catcher on the local semi-professional baseball team.

Aired by the three local TV stations in July 1984.

CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS: Adopted safety belt usage as a yearly project.

Several organizations including a local Women's Junior Auxiliary and the DAR.

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>EDUCATORS</u> : Educated HS students with assistance of project staff and driver's ed instructors. Taught Beltman classes in elementary schools.	Seven high schools with about 1,000 students each. Nine area elementary schools received kits.
<u>PUBLIC OFFICIALS</u> : Support by the mayor for initiatives.	Appearance at kickoff ceremonies. Proclamations.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

Pamphlets, posters, and bumper stickers.

Given to numerous organizations.

News releases.

Picked up by the media. Also follow-up by the media.

PRESENTATIONS

The film "Room To Live."

Shown to businesses, public agencies, other organizations.

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

The Metrocenter Traffic Safety Display. It included the Beltmobile, the convincer, a totalled car, and materials.

Conducted annually. About 45,000 to 60,000 people viewed the display each year.

A Traffic Safety Day held in a downtown park. Small incentives given away.

Several hundred people viewed the display.

Traffic safety displays at local and state conventions; a Traffic Accidents Report sign in front of police headquarters; advertising on public benches; reminders on a bank's message board and city billboards; two safety belt banners occasionally used on downtown streets.

No numbers given.

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

A safety belt competition (use rates) among city high schools. Small incentives given out during contest.

Seven high schools with about 1000 students each. Two awards given out at completion.

The film "Room to Live" shown to junior and senior high school students.

Several thousand students viewed the film.

A workshop sponsored by the Jackson Public Schools.

About 150 junior and senior high school students attended.

Two presentations for the Mayor's Youth Council, one of which included a speech from a spinal cord injury victim.

The group consisted of about 40 outstanding high school age students.

A competition for children involving photos of them using safety belts/child restraints. Small incentives given.

Fifty children principally of grammar school age.

Beltman kits sent to nine elementary schools.

A teacher in each of the 9 schools was instructed on use.

Educational program on the child restraint law.

800+ kindergarten and private nursery school children.

BUSINESSES

Letters sent to businesses and manufacturers providing information and offering assistance on developing programs and policies.

Two series of letters were sent to 226 businesses. About 40 businesses have mandatory use policies and others have encouragement policies.

A full page in the Safety Council Newsletter on the need for employee policies.

The mailing list included over 350 businesses, organizations, and governments statewide.

"Room To Live" shown to city employees and numerous businesses.

Used monthly by the city safety coordinator; about 2500 city employees saw it. Hundreds of employees in other businesses saw it.

Corporate workshop that covered the benefits of use policies.

Fifty corporate executives attended the workshop.

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

OUTREACH

Project staff developed a portfolio that explained and described the Comprehensive Program. It was used as a tool to instruct others.

The report listed appearances in 10 states plus the District of Columbia. These included conferences, meetings, workshops, and special courses. There also was specific assistance requested by public officials.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS

Three citywide incentive programs involving spotter identification over the radio of persons wearing safety belts and showing special stickers.

5/83-7/83 (pre-study period), 11/83-12/83, and 8/85. Prizes given, including drawings for grand prizes.

Beltmobile was initiated as a high profile method of providing incentives to citizens on a continuing basis. Daily giveaways.

2/84 to present. The vehicle spends 2-8 hours each weekday on the streets. Also featured at displays, parking lots, malls, and special events.

EVALUATION MEASURES

	4/83	5/83	12/83	3/84	7/84		
<u>OBSERVATION DATA (10 Sites)</u>							
Driver Restraint Usage	5.8%	12.3%	13.8%	10.8%	19%		
	7/84	1/85	6/85	9/85			
<u>OBSERVATION DATA (16 Sites)</u>							
Driver Restraint Usage	21.4%	34.1%	33.2%	37%			
	9/83	12/84					
<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>							
Child Restraint Usage	13%	48%					
<u>OBSERVATION DATA (High Schools)</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pre-Competition Usage Rate	43%	20%	2%	7%	2%	0%	19%
Post-Competition Usage Rate	65%	11%	-	-	-	-	26%

TELEPHONE SURVEY

Those age 65 and under, of higher socio-economic status, and with greater education were more likely to wear safety belts.

OPINION POLL

Between 86% and 87% would support a mandatory use law and 48% would use safety belts if a law passed.

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Jackson received an award in March 1985 as the city in the nation with the most increased usage rate for safety belt wearers. The evaluation report attributed the success of the project to community involvement. This in turn was influenced by strong media coverage and support. In particular, major initiatives received extensive coverage at kickoff.

JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

EXHIBIT B-4: NORTH PLAINFIELD, NEW JERSEY

Population: 19,100

Program Period: 3/84 - 9/86

State SUBL: Enacted 11/84; Effective 3/85; Fine Effective 3/85

Fine: \$20 Enforcement: Secondary

Program Dimensions: Face to face education, incentive promotions, safety belt demonstrations, and an ongoing public information campaign.

MEDIA

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>RADIO/TV/NEWSPAPER</u>	
Multimedia involvement in the promotion of the incentive campaign.	No details given.
Radio interview with the project leaders.	Reached thousands of people during the one hour program.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

COALITIONS

An executive committee of six members was responsible for the design and implementation of all networking methods and procedures related to the infrastructure of the project.

Members were the Project Director, the Mayor, the Traffic Safety Director, the Chief of Police, a representative from the New Jersey Office of Highway Safety, and the Project Coordinator.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

A number of organizations were cited as having become part of the community networking system.

Local fire, police, rescue squad, hospital, and schools. Also local medical associations, civic organizations, business groups, and media.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

PRESENTATIONS

Films, video tapes, and slide presentations were used to educate residents.

Education was accomplished at all age levels.

NORTH PLAINFIELD, NEW JERSEY

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

PRESENTATIONS

Grammar school children were given mini presentations that included safety handouts given out at the conclusion. High school students received more sophisticated presentations that included guest speakers.

No numbers given.

Evening lectures were provided to adults in the high school auditorium. These gatherings also served as a forum for awarding incentives to persons who had been observed wearing safety belts.

No numbers given.

Lectures were given to representatives from law enforcement agencies, fire departments, and rescue squads.

No numbers given.

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

Banners displayed buckle up messages.

Displayed in front of the Borough Hall.

Roadway signs with the message "Buckle-Up" and "Don't Drink 'N Drive."

Located along local and municipal roads in North Plainfield.

Coordinated safety posters.

Displayed in business establishments throughout the municipality.

A Safety Logo applied to the mail.

All mail sent out of North Plainfield.

Convincer Day held at a local fast food restaurant. Free breakfasts were awarded and litter bags, key chains, stickers, and balloons given out.

One-day event that included interviews of participants by the radio and other media.

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

A safety belt presentation for driver education classes consisting of a discussion of the benefits of safety belt use, a film, and a question and answer session.

All driver education classes.

NORTH PLAINFIELD, NEW JERSEY

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

A "Back to School" program that consisted of a short talk on the benefits of safety belt use, a film, a demonstration on how to use a safety belt properly, and a question and answer session.

Conducted during September at all of the borough schools.

A safety belt poster contest that awarded gift certificates to winners.

Conducted in the five elementary schools in North Plainfield; 500 students participated.

Introduced the "Make it Click" campaign at one of the grammar school fairs. Incentive awards were provided to children and adults who signed pledge cards.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS

Ongoing community-wide incentive program. Incentives were awarded directly (immediately after having been observed wearing a safety belt), indirectly (having been reported to have worn a safety belt), or through a raffle (among safety belt wearers).

Incentive promotion occurred through radio, cable tv, news media, bulletins, lectures, discussions, subcommittees, and businesses.

B.E.L.T.S. program launched by the mayor's office that instructed officers to issue a summons and a child safety seat to drivers of vehicles transporting children unsafely.

Information distributed to the media and a proclamation by the mayor's office relating to the All-American Buckle Up.

The last week in November 1985.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	3/84	11/84	10/85	6/86
Adult Usage Rate for				
Drivers and Passengers	7.35%	20.31%	42.29%	39.27%
Infant and Toddler Usage	56.25%	72.72%	54.45%	64.10%

NORTH PLAINFIELD, NEW JERSEY

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

As a conclusion, the report noted the "rewarding" experience of presenting programs to young people. It indicated that they were receptive to the information and they played an active part in encouraging their parents and others to use safety belts.

NORTH PLAINFIELD, NEW JERSEY

EXHIBIT B-5: SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Population: City - 48,953 (1980)

Program Period: 1/84 - 12/86

State SBUL: Enacted 4/85; Effective 1/86; Fine Effective 1/86

Fine: \$25-\$50 Enforcement: Primary

Child Restraint Law Enforcement 7/85

Program Dimensions: The Santa Fe Seat Belt Campaign consisted of the establishment of a city-wide committee to oversee the program; an intensive education phase; an incentive campaign; observation of safety belt usage; and on-going evaluation of results.

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO/TV/NEWSPAPERS

Education activities included announcements, articles, and interviews with the newspaper, television, and radio media.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

COALITIONS

The mayor appointed a 14-member blue ribbon committee to oversee program activities. It included the Mayor, the City Manager, the Attorney General, the Superintendent of Public Schools, the President of the College of Santa Fe, the Chamber of Commerce Director, a City Councilman, a representative from a local hospital, two representatives from the Health Services Division, two representatives from local businesses, and representatives from a local newspaper and radio station.

The committee decided that it would not be a working committee but would be available for special functions and would meet whenever the chairperson thought it necessary.

The committee oversaw programmatic activities while the performing organization (New Mexico Health and Environment Department, Health Services Division) oversaw daily activities and the evaluation of the campaign.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

Police: Assisted with the citywide incentive program by acting as spotters.

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

BUSINESSES: Donated prizes for the citywide incentive program. Also distributed prizes.

The incentive campaign gave out over 4,700 prizes donated by more than 100 businesses.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS: Served on the committee. Established a national safety belt contest.

See other sections.

VOLUNTEERS: Acted as spotters and gave out prizes for the incentive campaign.

Businesses had to be recruited to give out prizes because of difficulties in finding enough volunteers.

MEDIA: Provided access for interviews, dissemination of information.

See media section above.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

Educational materials included bumper stickers, brochures, and posters.

PRESENTATIONS

Over 70 educational talks were given.

Reached 3,400 people not including fairs, promotional events, radio, and TV.

Talks were given to civic, church, and club groups.

Reached about 300 persons across groups.

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

Events in the downtown area and in shopping malls.

BUSINESSES

Workshops that included talks, films, and slide shows were presented to major employers.

Reached about 2,200 staff and employees from public and private employers.

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Presented safety belt awareness programs and promotions in the schools. This included a Beltman play and Lucky 13 film shown in elementary schools and short term incentive programs in the two high schools.

The program reached all teachers and students of five elementary schools.

Safety belt usage of high school students after incentive programs increased from 34% to 51% at one school and from 44% to 65% at another.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS

A citywide incentive campaign awarded small prizes to persons observed wearing safety belts. These persons also received a brochure explaining the campaign and became eligible for monthly and grand prizes.

The awarding of prizes was conducted in two major phases, the first from June through November 1984 and the second June through August 1985. Over 4,700 prizes were given away.

The Mayor of Santa Fe challenged all cities with populations exceeding 15,000 to a national safety belt contest, the winner getting an attractive traveling trophy.

A total of 26 cities entered the 1984 challenge, with 13 subsequently submitting data.

The challenge is now in its third year.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	3/84	6/84	3/85	5/86
	to 4/84	to 8/84	to 5/85	to 6/86
Drivers	6.7%	17.2%	21.2%	59.1%
Male	5.5%	16.5%	19.9%	56.8%
Females	8.8%	18.2%	22.6%	61.2%
Child Restraints	16.8%	23.9%	53.7%	68.1%
Male Drivers	21.2%	24.7%	54.1%	79.7%
Female Drivers	15.3%	23.6%	53.5%	64.3%

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

EVALUATION MEASURES (continued)

<u>KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE SURVEYS</u>	10/85	5/86
Wear safety belts when drive around town:		
Always	39.5%	80.5%
Sometimes	31.0%	11.9%
Never	29.5%	7.5%

<u>KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE SURVEYS</u>	10/85	5/86
Wear safety belts on long trips:		
Always	57.5%	85.0%
Sometimes	23.5%	8.4%
Never	19.0%	6.6%
Wear safety belts during inclement road conditions:		
Always	45.5%	82.7%
Sometimes	34.0%	10.6%
Never	20.5%	6.6%
Small child rides in a child seat:		
Always	85.7%	91.5%
Sometimes	14.3%	4.3%
Never	0.0%	4.3%

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Safety belt usage and car seat usage both showed better than a three-fold increase during the incentive phase of the program. Later observation data taken after implementation of the safety belt law showed a sharp increase in safety belt usage.

EXHIBIT B-6: ROCKLAND COUNTY, NEW YORK

Population: 259,530 (1980)

Program Period: 7/84 - 10/86

State SBUL: Enacted 7/12/84; Effective 12/1/84; Fine Effective 1/1/85

Fine: \$0 - 50 Enforcement Method: Primary

Program Dimensions: Program started as an expansion of a child restraint program. There were six components: County Employee, Corporate Program, Hospitals, School Program, Media/Public Information, and Law Enforcement.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

To increase usage of Occupant Restraints to as near 100% as possible;

To increase public awareness of the necessity of safety belts;

To reduce severity of injuries from accidents;

To counteract fallacies for not using safety belts.

Each component had its own separate set of objectives.

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO

Public Service announcements were developed and aired six times a day on local radio station WRKL beginning in November, 1984.

No measures of market penetration were provided.

NEWSPAPERS

Coverage is described as excellent. Estimate one article per week in the local papers.

No measures of readership were provided.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COUNTY EMPLOYEES PROGRAM

County employee safety belt usage policy was initiated by passage of Resolution 452 in the county legislature mandating use of safety belts by all county employees and passengers in county owned vehicles, distribution of brochures to all county employees, of safety belt literature in payroll checks, dashboard decals on County vehicles to county employees, and bumper stickers.

All materials distributed to 3,000 county employees on a total of six different occasions.

HOSPITALS

Programs included:

Presentation to the Health and Safety Committee of the hospital by the Director of the Rockland Safety Belt Program.

No information is presented on the number of persons exposed to these informational programs.

Safety belt posters displayed inside the hospital, Buckle-Up signs in the parking lots, safety belt materials distributed through the payroll system, and safety belt materials distributed in the emergency room.

SCHOOL PROGRAM

Program coordinator met several times with the Rockland County School Superintendents Association and received their support.

Four schools requested educational materials and distributed 35,000 pamphlets and brochures, primarily the "Buckle-Up" brochure. Other schools agreed to distribute materials, though the amount is undocumented.

No good measures of intensity are available beyond the number of pieces distributed.

ROCKLAND COUNTY, NEW YORK

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Regular meetings with the 12 police chiefs in the county, presentation at basic police training schools, discussion about how to best enforce the New York Seat Belt Law, brochures distributed to training sessions at Police Academy.

No estimates are provided.

CORPORATE PROGRAM

Lederere Laboratories initiated an employee program prior to the effective date of the state law. Activities included: letters, posters, information to promote the state law; two day seminar that all employees attended, including four lectures and a film strip; incentive program for using safety belts (exchange of wooden token for merchandise); Packaging Department jointly sponsored demonstration of the convincer with the NYSPD.

Includes 325 employees.

Orange and Rockland Utilities initiated a corporate program conducted by the safety department. Includes regular training sessions with film presentation, new employee orientation, paycheck distribution.

No information given on the number of individuals covered.

Eastern Division of Xerox developed weekly presentations to groups of its 150 employees, distribution of safety materials, and paycheck distribution.

Program includes 150 employees.

The Savings Bank of Rockland County agreed to distribute safety materials to its employees.

No information given on the number of employees contacted.

ROCKLAND COUNTY, NEW YORK

PUBLIC INFORMATION/EDUCATION

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
Local car dealership developed a program for its customers. Made commitment to promote safety belt just like any other feature.	Distributed 3,800 brochures.
Buckle-Up brochure was translated into spanish and distributed through 12 police department in the county.	Approximately 6,000 brochures were thus distributed.
Police Athletic League distributed book covers.	10,000 book covers distributed.
McDonalds Restaurant distributed Buckle-Up brochures through its 4 outlets in the county.	No estimate provided.
Public speaking training session was given by the NY State Coalition for Safety Belt Use and a public relations firm. Attended by law enforcement, hospital and nursing staff.	No estimate provided.

EVALUATION MEASURES

	8/84	6/85	12/85	8/86
<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>				
Drivers Observed Wearing Belt	28.1%	72%	53.9%	52.7%
Front Stat Passenger Observed Wearing Belt	27.8%	65.1%	45.6%	54.8%

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The Rockland County, New York program appears to have been well developed in terms of having clear program goals and attainable goals of the six specific sub-programs. Unfortunately there is little specific information about the intensity or exposure of the program activities. The variation in safety belt usage indicates possible confounding with the child restraint program and passage of the nation's first safety belt use law in late 1984. The variation was found not only in Rockland County, but also in state-wide use surveys.

ROCKLAND COUNTY, NEW YORK

EXHIBIT B-7: SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK

Population: 1,284,231 (1980)

Program Period: 1/84 - 12/85

State SBUL: Enacted 7/12/84; Effective 12/1/84; Fine Effective 1/1/85

Fine: \$0 - 50 Enforcement Method: Primary

Program Funds: Not Given

Program Dimensions: The program had six components: county employees, corporate sector, medical/health sector, education sector, law enforcement sector and the general public.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Conduct a County Employee Safety Belt Program for about 10,000 employees.

Inform at least 115 County businesses about the advantages of instituting educational safety belt programs for their employees.

Implement a minimum of ten comprehensive corporate safety belt programs by June 1985.

Establish employee safety belt programs in all 13 community hospitals in Suffolk County by June 1985.

Conduct an educational safety belt presentation for Suffolk County PTA.

Distribute safety belt information pamphlets to all school bus drivers and pupils transported.

Present five 30-minute safety belt assemblies for grades K-12.

Present at least 100 safety belt awareness programs for various schools and community organizations.

Broadcast at least three PSAs on a minimum of ten radio stations between June 30 and September 30, 1984.

Establish a transit advertising campaign.

Distribute safety belt pamphlets and materials to community organizations and the general public.

SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO/TV

Six radio stations broadcast PSA's. During the second year, PSA's were added to the Shadow Traffic Report.

Six stations broadcast PSA's at between 4 and 10 times per day.

Local radio and TV stations produced talk shows about the program.

No measures of intensity or exposure are available.

NEWSPAPERS

No materials in newspapers were discussed in the evaluation.

No measures are presented.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

COALITIONS

The County Executive's Office provided the full time coordinator. Members of the coalition included members of the county medical society, health commission, PTA, police department, safety office, highway patrol, an insurance company, traffic control office, local Teamsters Union, president of the local transportation company.

Task force was divided into five subcommittees: business, medical/-health, professionals, education, law enforcement, and community outreach. Each subcommittee developed its own goals. The major activities in the program were carried out by the staff and many volunteers.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

COUNTY EMPLOYEES

A major focal point of this program was County Employee Program, due in large part to the vigorous support of the county executive.

8,000 employees attended 20-minute education programs, 5,000 signed pledge cards to wear safety belts, 2,000 attended a defensive driving program, and 330 new employees attended orientation programs.

LOCAL BUSINESSES

Ten local employers conducted awareness programs and distributed safety belt materials to their employees.

65 small business representatives attended seminars on the program. Two corporate safety belt programs were established and nine other companies either distributed materials to employees or conducted awareness programs.

SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

LOCAL BUSINESSES

The Long Island Chapter of the American Society of Safety Engineers (ASSE) developed and implemented a safety belt awareness program.

This was distributed to 150 members of ASSE.

GEICO Insurance Company held several activities involving safety belt use for its employees.

About 600 employees were reached in 19 educational sessions, along with 1,000 in other sessions.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company printed 500,000 book covers with "Buckle-Up" messages.

These covers were distributed to local students in the 1984 school year.

MEDICAL COMMUNITY

Presentations were made to workers at area hospitals, health clinics, and to other professionals.

A seminar was attended by 50 participants. Pamphlets and bumper stickers were also distributed.

EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY

Presentations were made to the PTA, and an assembly program was developed. Follow-up classroom activity was also included following the assemblies.

Estimated that 34 school assemblies were presented to a total of 17,000 students.

Higher education institutions contributed through films, bumper stickers, pamphlets and film and slide shows in the student center. In addition, two college health fairs were held.

No estimates of exposure were provided.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAMS

The Suffolk County Comprehensive Safety Belt Program established a Speakers Bureau. Task force members, county executive staff, Suffolk County Traffic Safety Board, and the Suffolk County Police Department conducted presentations to the public.

125 presentations were made to approximately 19,000 persons.

Three libraries displayed safety belt display materials out of 58 libraries total.

No estimate of the exposure.

SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAMS</u>	
County police distributed brochures during All American Buckle-Up Week.	8,000 brochures distributed.
REACT distributed brochures along Long Island Expressway.	Distributed 4,000 pamphlets during a 3 day period.
Red Cross distributed safety belt safety brochures during normal training class.	8,000 brochures distributed.

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

Five public information campaigns were carried out by local gasoline dealers and auto dealers. These included incentive prizes for safety belt use, radio spots, distribution of safety belt materials, decals and displays in shopping malls.

No estimates of the extent of coverage of these activities were provided.

TRANSIT ADVERTISING

Local 237 of the Teamsters, on the Task Force, sponsored a Transit Sign Public Information Campaign.

This was a 13 month campaign during which 60 large signs were displayed in buses expected to reach one-half million people.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>TELEPHONE SURVEY</u>	1983	1984		
Regularly Use Belts	34%	49%		
[Other]	29%	24%		
Never Use Belts	39%	27%		
 <u>OBSERVATION SURVEY</u>	 6/83	 10/83	 10/84	 10/85
Drivers Restrained	7.4%	11.8%	24.4%	50%
Passenger Restrained	5.4%	8.9%	20.1%	46.5%

SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Because of the passage of the New York Seat Belt Use Law in December, 1984, it is impossible to separate the effect of the Suffolk County program from the effect of the law. The major strengths of this program were the County Employees Program, due in large part to the strong backing of the County Executive, the School Program, which reached about 17,000 students in assemblies, the transit advertising program supported by Local 237 of the Teamsters Union, and the Speakers Bureau, in which 125 presentations reached 19,000 persons. The corporate and health care programs were less successful, primarily due to lack of commitment on the part of management in these two settings.

EXHIBIT B-8: BISMARK, NORTH DAKOTA

Population: 44,485 (1980)

Program Period: 1/84 - 4/86

State SBUL: None.

Program Grant: \$4,000 Federal, \$2,000 State Highway Funds

Program Dimensions: Primarily an educational program with incentives introduced in the second year.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

To establish a model city safety belt and child safety program in Bismark, North Dakota.

To increase safety belt and child seat usage rates from 2% and 6%, respectively, to 25% in the first year.

To further increase usage rates to 50% in the second year.

To generate enough community involvement with the Chamber of Commerce, Bismark Safety Council, local businesses, and Civic groups to maintain the program at a 40% usage rate.

To evaluate the project meeting NHTSA requirements.

To coordinate this program with the emphasis on alcohol countermeasures.

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO/TV

Coverage of the program, generally considered good, was primarily through talk shows and PSA's. A special media-only breakfast was held at the beginning of the incentive phase of the program. This was well attended, but did not result in very extensive coverage of the incentive program.

No systematic data on media penetration were provided.

Program personnel made 14 appearances on local TV programs, and 3 radio shows. There were 4 different PSA campaigns launched, and 2 press conferences held.

NEWSPAPERS

Although press releases were sent to newspapers, little mention of the printed media appeared in the chronology of program events.

The Bismark Tribune did feature a special feature page on safety belts toward the end of the program.

BISMARK, NORTH DAKOTA

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COALITIONS

The Buckle Up Bismark Task Force, with 20 members representing local public and private organizations, was formed by the Mayor following a kickoff breakfast.

The task force served primarily as an advisory group. Attendance tapered off greatly over the course of the program.

The program coordinator, who had donated substantial time, left the area and was replaced by someone who lacked the same level of commitment.

Task force met 13 times during year one and 12 times during year 2.

It appears that the members of the task force did not have sufficient time to commit to task force activities over the long run.

It appears that substantial time must be committed by a leader to maintain the level of activity from remaining committee members. Eventually, a subcommittee structure was replaced by a single task force committee, which consisted of the core members with continuing interest in the program.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

POLICE: Made appearances on radio and TV broadcasts to promote the program's objectives.

Participated in the incentive program by thanking in writing those persons observed to wear safety belts.

BUSINESSES: Local banks participated in incentive programs by distributing materials to drivers wearing safety belts.

Local restaurants were given 10,000 tray liners encouraging safety belt use.

Appeared on at least 5 programs.

Safety belt use was incorporated into promotional materials about the 50th anniversary of the State Highway Patrol. There were no estimates of the number of letters sent.

There were 854 prizes distributed in 3 days of the program, along with 1525 pamphlets to persons not wearing safety belts.

12 of 13 restaurants distributed the tray liners.

BISMARK, NORTH DAKOTA

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>VOLUNTEERS:</u> Volunteers provided a substantial portion of the program efforts. They provided many of the speakers and distributed information packets and incentive packs during the two program phases.	The Optimist Club held an incentive program at the Gateway Mall, where 157 prizes were distributed.
<u>STATE EMPLOYEES:</u> State employees make up a large group in Bismark. Although the Governor and Commissioner of Highways are opposed to Safety belt Use Laws, they do favor educational efforts to increase use. Two programs were held with state employees: an incentive program of food in the cafeterias for entering parking lot with safety belt attached; and a pledge drive, in which those who pledged to use safety belt were eligible for a drawing.	Representatives of Jaycee Women, Girl Scouts and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program distributed 261 incentive packets and 929 information packets in 14 one-hour periods. Surveys of safety belt use indicated that use increased from 15% to 35% of state employees using the parking lot. 80 employees received prizes. A follow up survey 2 weeks later indicated a 30% use rate. About 450 state employees returned pledges to increase belt use. 55 prizes were given to those who pledged to increase use.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS</u> Educational materials included bumper stickers, brochures, and posters. BUB pins were also printed and distributed. Groups requesting presentations were employees, civic clubs, parents groups, fraternal organizations, bankers and bank tellers.	5,000 pins and pamphlets were printed and distributed. At least 500 people were reached through presentations.
<u>SPEAKERS BUREAU:</u> An attempt at setting up a speakers bureau failed due to lack of commitment from committee members. Presentations were given by the Chairperson or	one other individual.

BISMARK, NORTH DAKOTA

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

Three displays were set during the course of the program, two at shopping malls and one at the Governor's Safety and Health Seminar. Mall displays included the Convincer, which was carried live on local TV news shows.

It was estimated that thousands viewed the display at shopping malls and hundreds at the Governor's Conference.

DISSEMINATION

Information stuffers were disseminated to student's households along with information on school bus programs.

10,000 information stuffers were distributed to local food stores.

Created a promotional character (BUB, an egg with a cowboy hat and boots) that was used as the program symbol.

BUB was used extensively during both program years to reach children. Its popularity led to its being used for statewide promotions.

BUSINESSES: A corporate safety program for employers was held. This included information on how to establish a safety belt program within their own companies.

About 5 companies sent representatives.

Presentations on safety belt use were made to employees of the Montana-Dakota Utilities.

Approximately 200 employees attended. The company has a mandatory on-the-job policy.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	3/84	10/84	9/85*	4/86*
No Belt Used	93.1% 1575	86.3% 1587	86.6% 1927	85% 1849
Lap Only or L/S Used	6.9% 117	13.7% 252	13.4% 259	15% 278
Lap Only	2.5%	2.0%		
Lap/Shoulder	5.4%	11.7%		

* Does not include lap only observations.

Comparison with control sites (Minot and Grand Forks) indicate that the Bismark users increased safety belt use by 117% over two years while the control sites increased by 65% and 26%.

BISMARK, NORTH DAKOTA

EVALUATION MEASURES (continued)

<u>Mail Survey</u>	<u>1984*</u>	<u>1985*</u>	<u>1985C**</u>
Always Use a Safety belt	9.2% (48)	16.9% (56)	13.6% (21)
Only Special Circumstances	46.7% (224)	52.6% (174)	52.6% (81)
Don't Use Safety belt	44.1% (231)	30.5% (101)	33.8% (52)

* Longitudinal group, sampled twice.

** Independent control group sample of residents

Reported use in the mail survey increased between 1984 and 1985 surveys, although not sufficient to meet the program goals. The control group appears quite comparable to the longitudinal sample.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

This program was moderately successful, given the social climate in North Dakota. The state is very conservative and very opposed to safety belt use laws as an infringement on individual liberties. The program suffered from changes in coordinators in mid-program from one who provided large amounts of outside time to the program to one who did not make that commitment. The program itself was a minimal one, with poorly attended educational programs and sporadic incentive events. Some of these problems were due to the poor weather conditions in the area.

BISMARK, NORTH DAKOTA

EXHIBIT B-9: TULSA, OKLAHOMA

Population: 360,919 (1980)

Program Period: 10/84 - 9/86

State SBUL: Enacted 6/4/85; Effective 2/1/87 Fine Effective 2/1/87

Fine: \$25; Enforcement Method: Secondary

Program Funds: \$ 50,258 Total Project Costs (includes \$24,300 donated air time.)

Program Dimensions: Program started through the Tulsa Area Chapter of the American Red Cross. This was a continuation and expansion of a previous program to increase usage of safety belt and child restraints.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The establishment of an educational program in the day care centers, K-5, and the high schools;

The establishment of in-house safety belt programs within business and industry;

Cooperation with the local police department and local media to assure that safety belt and child seat usage is reported in accident investigations and the subsequent media coverage that occurs;

The establishment of a coalition consisting of a concerned civic leaders and representatives for organizations and businesses to address the issue of occupant protection.

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO/TV

All 4 major Tulsa TV stations covered the fall 1984 campaign kickoff, which featured the Mayor of Tulsa.

There appears to have been no other systematic media plan than this kickoff coverage.

In 1985, Tulsa radio and TV stations provided child safety information through talk shows, call in topics on radio and special news features.

NEWSPAPERS

Area newspapers included mention of safety belt use in daily accident reports and in picture captions.

In February, 1985 3 editorials were featured in the two major Tulsa newspapers.

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COALITIONS

The "Get-It-Together, Tulsa" coalition was not seen as being at all engaged in this program. Most of the program activities were directly carried out by the program coordinator.

Another Tulsa organization, Buckle Every Little Tot (BELT) did not actively cooperate with the Tulsa MCP.

There were four basic subgroups of coalitions. The business and industry coalition included 9 members. The K-12 school age coalition member included 9 members, such as the Boy and Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Inc., PTA and school representatives. The Child Restraints members represented the largest group, with 16 members, mostly from health organizations and the JayCeers. There were 21 members of the general public, including the mayor, public safety officials, AAA and the printed media.

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT: Tulsa was the first municipality to require employees to wear safety belts.

This was a one-time fanfare event that featured a public appearance by the Mayor of Tulsa.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS: The Tulsa school system promoted belt use. In the second year educational and contest components were added.

The public schools appear to have been the major avenue of promotion of safety belt use, primarily through child restraint.

LOCAL BUSINESS: minimal participation of local employers was encouraged. Local businesses provided prizes for the Safe Driver Program for public school students.

This was a one time program promoted during the second year.

LOCAL EMPLOYERS: The Ford Glass Plant held a community open house at which those in attendance had the opportunity to ride the "convincer", a device that simulates a 10 mph crash.

This was a one time only event, which was attended by approximately 5,000 persons.

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

The Coalition Newsletter.

No data given.

Other materials included films and videos, employee safety meetings, safety belt/child safety seat posters, bumper stickers, brochures, and paycheck inserts.

Only five private employers with employee programs indicated that they had been contacted by the coordinator. One frustrated respondent indicated that they had to contact the American Red Cross themselves to start a safety belt program.

PRESENTATIONS

Of these presentations, 133 (62%) were performed by the coordinator, 21% by others (primarily a Women's Health Program), and the rest by GITT (9%) and BELT (8%).

149 presentations to school or pre-school children/parents, with 11,339 participants.

15 presentations to civic and professional groups, with 429 participants.

8 training workshops with 149 participants.

6 presentations to business and industry 464 participants.

23 booth exhibits with an estimated 316,935 participants.

Incentive Programs.

2 programs with a total of 1,008 participants.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	6/84	6/85	5/86	10/86
Driver Observed	2414	2505	1600	1600
Wearing Belt	13.4%	16.9%	26.3%	29.3%
Front Seat Passenger Observed	754	930	553	581
Wearing Belt	13.8%	15.9%	26.0%	33.1%

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The evaluation report termed the activities sponsored by the Tulsa model community project "varied" and "extensive." However, it also stated that the program thrust was overwhelmingly aimed at the users or potential users of child safety seats. The coordinator, who was listed as being in charge of over 60 percent of program events, seemed most comfortable in a role that required her to be the prime contact if not the principal presenter for a series of one-time events involving child safety seats. Far less time was devoted to safety belt activities. According to the report, there was an impression that the coordinator was not highly effective in pursuing the larger goal of the program -- to establish a permanent, visible, active occupant protection program.

The evaluation report concluded that the occupant protection program in Tulsa was a worthwhile investment. Its principal recommendation was that steps be taken to assure adequate local support for program continuance. Further suggestions: 1) the coordinator should spend less time on presentations, 2) the coordinator should more actively solicit the ideas and involvement of coalition members, 3) a speakers bureau should become a more central part of the program, 4) more should be done with large employers, 5) more emphasis should be placed on incentive programs, and 6) efforts should continue in expanding the availability of child safety seats.

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

EXHIBIT B-10: SAN ANTONIO AND BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

Population: City - 785,880 (1980); County - 988,800 (1980)

Program Period: 1/84 - 12/85

State SUBL: Enacted 6/85; Effective 9/85; Fine Effective 12/85

Fine: \$25-\$50 Enforcement: Primary

Program Dimensions: Challenges, contests, and incentive programs to increase safety belt use.

Initial Goals

To increase safety belt usage from current levels (8.7%) to at least 20% by the end of the contracting period.

To develop major employer and community programs that become institutionalized as ongoing community health/safety activities.

To measure, and improve upon, the attitudes and awareness of the San Antonio community toward safety belt use.

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO

Appearances on talk shows and taped/live interviews. Topics covered included safety belt information and program goals, special events (e.g., the CEO Challenge, the High School Challenge, Project Graduation, poster contests), and the mandatory use law.

Broadcast across the two year period. Hundreds of thousands of persons were exposed to the messages.

Safety belt messages and stories broadcast during (bad) weather reports.

Broadcast during the winter.

Informational and promotional PSAs.

More pronounced during the second year.

TV

News stories and segments providing safety belt information and publicizing activities and events.

A week-long series during 8/84, stories on Project Graduation during 2/85, PM Magazine segment Summer85.

Informational and promotional PSAs.

Broadcast during both years.

SAN ANTONIO AND BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

MEDIA (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>NEWSPAPERS</u> News and feature articles covering the program and special activities.	Continuous during the two years.
Publicizing of accidents where motorists were saved by safety belts.	Noted in the third quarter 1984 report.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

<u>EDUCATORS</u> : Helped promote numerous activities in the schools. Various programs sponsored by the PTA.	See school activities section.
<u>MEDIA</u> : Continuous communication of safety belt information and program activities.	See media section.
<u>BUSINESSES</u> : Instrumental in the CEO Challenge. Instituted policies and programs for employees. Made donations for incentive items.	See special events section.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

Distributed informational materials, tokens, promotional materials, and specific campaign materials to schools, PTAs, businesses, and others.	Thousands of materials given out.
Distributed a device consisting of a giant firecracker with information on safe driving and a "buckle up" coin.	About 1200 were distributed at movie theaters.

PRESENTATIONS

Formed a Speakers Bureau and developed a Speakers Bureau Kit.	The Speakers Bureau became a formalized entity late in the first year.
---	--

SAN ANTONIO AND BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

A billboard campaign which provided a simple message to use safety belts.

Use of a mascot (person in a "Buckie" costume) to march in parades.

Manned booths and displays at community fairs, malls, and special events.

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Conducted informational and incentive programs in the schools. Assisted with a grant awarded to the PTA for awareness programs.

Presentations to students, educators, parents, and PTAs.

BUSINESS ACTIVITIES

Presentations to businesses and their employees.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS

Kickoff ceremony/press conference for the campaign on January 10, 1984.

CEO Challenge in which major corporations and businesses competed to see which could achieve the greatest increase in safety belt use among employees. Employers created/augmented safety belt programs for their employees.

Fifty billboards were donated for March 1984.

Marched in one parade and passed out more than 1,000 buttons. Discontinued for want of a better vehicle.

Tens of thousands of persons viewed the displays. Thousands of pieces of informational materials were given out.

Forty-four elementary schools had adopted some sort of programming by the end of 1984. Program efforts were considered significant in ten out of the 13 school districts in 1985. Programs were initiated or continuing in 40 high schools during 1985.

Thousands of persons were reached.

Presentations made before more than 1,000 employees.

Over 80 participants including representatives from charities, school districts, businesses, military bases, and government. Wide representation from area media.

Three major employers competed in the 1984 competition. At the end of the 1985 program (101 days of summer), 51 employers had conducted some type of safety belt education. About 95,000 employees were directly affected by the 1985 CEO Challenge.

SAN ANTONIO AND BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS</u>	
High School Challenge in which high schools competed to increase safety belt usage. The schools established various promotional and incentive campaigns.	Five high schools joined the Challenge in 1984. More than thirty high schools participated in 1985.
Poster contests for elementary school children.	Only a handful of entries received during the 1984 contest. Over 400 entries received from ten of the 13 school districts at the end of the 1985 contest.
Community-wide incentive program developed and implemented with PM Magazine of a local television station.	Over 5,000 pledges were returned and viewership audience for the week-long promotion was 80,000 per day.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	11/83	5/84	1/85	5/85	12/85
Driver Usage	9.7%	15.3%	20.5%	26.8%	76.7%

Persons who were older, female, non-hispanic, and/or in high income census tracts were more likely to use safety belts. Demographic differences tended to level off after the SBUL.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Program impediments included the slim funding margin, which presented organizational difficulties in carrying out current programs and developing new ones. Activities were reduced during the latter part of the first year while strategies were developed to leverage resources.

Program success was attributed to the ability to diversify and change while remaining a viable program. Efforts were tested, refined, then broad-based to a specific market segment. The ability to change was abetted by the volunteer nature of the project, as extensive networking brought in persons with fresh ideas and perspectives. According to the report, the single most important aspect of the program was not the message, but rather the network on which it was carried.

SAN ANTONIO AND BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

EXHIBIT B-11: UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

Population: 218,106 (1980)

Program Period: 6/84 - 12/86

State SBUL: Enacted 3/86; Effective 4/86; Fine Effective 4/86

Child Restraint Law Enacted 7/84

Fine: \$10 Enforcement: Secondary

Program Dimensions: The program objectives targeted a variety of populations in the county and promoted activities which were educational and used incentives to encourage safety restraint use.

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO

PSAs aired by the major radio station in Provo.

Broadcast from the beginning of the project.

Promoted a radio/incentive program.

September 1986 wrap-up event. See events section below.

Promoted the new Utah Seat Belt Law. Periodic discussion of the new law and review of safety belt facts. Promotional T-shirts given away.

Occurred the two weeks after enactment. A safety belt message was announced after each weather report, given twice every hour.

NEWSPAPER

Articles submitted by the program.

Thirty-four news releases were published in local newspapers.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

COALITIONS

An Advisory Task Force that included representatives from the County Commission, County Dental Society, Nebo School District, LDS Church, PTA, County Medical Society, County Medical Auxiliary, Ministerial Association, Geneva Steel, Local Hospitals, American Red Cross, County Women's Council, Provo School District, and Law Enforcement.

Task force involvement was limited during the project, with the PTA and Law Enforcement providing the most consistent support. Others attended meetings but did little else, viewing themselves as an advisory council only. Much of what was accomplished was done by the coordinator rather than Task Force members.

UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES</u>	
<u>RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS:</u> Local churches disseminated a safety belt curriculum packet developed by the program.	120 packets were distributed with a potential audience of 55,000. However, the churches showed relatively low usage.
<u>MEDIA:</u> Dissemination of news releases and PSAs.	See media section above.
<u>EDUCATORS:</u> Involved with activities and campaigns.	See school activities section.
<u>BUSINESSES:</u> Made donations to the program. Set up activities and policies for employees.	See businesses section.
<u>POLICE:</u> Task force involvement. Also involved in scattered activities.	A limited effort at gathering the support of law enforcement until the end of the project.
<u>MEDICAL COMMUNITY:</u> Sponsored health fairs, participated in some activities, set up programs for employees.	Health Department, hospitals, and medical center. Hospital activities included car seat loaner programs.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

<u>DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS</u> Safety belt information kits distributed to families without elementary-age children.	In April 1984, Provo Girl Scouts received 800 kits which they distributed to neighbors.
"3 Seconds to Safety" packets distributed to Cub Scout packs in Provo.	Over 150 kits were provided from 11/85 to 1/86, impacting about 2,000 Cub Scouts.
Distribution of safety belt reminder cards that consisted of a brief message stating "It's A Lifesaver" with an actual lifesaver attached.	Four hundred cards were printed and distributed to Provo physicians, dentists, podiatrists, hospitals, businesses, and utilities.
A card explaining Utah's child restraint law attached to each birth certificate worksheet.	Started in June 1986. Over 600 births in the four Utah County hospitals every month.

UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS</u>	
Brochures regarding Utah's safety belt law.	Approximately 250 brochures were distributed to car rental companies in September 1986.
Developed stickers for use on rear view mirrors that remind motorists to buckle up.	Thousands were distributed. Printing costs are \$300 for 6,000 stickers.
A special safety belt newsletter providing encouragement and information for businesses on instituting safety belt programs.	Mailed in June 1986 to Task Force members and other interested individuals. About 50 were sent out.
<u>PRESENTATIONS</u>	
The Women's Council sponsored a Provo Town Meeting. The film "It'll Never Happen to Me" accompanied a safety belt presentation.	About 50 people attended the January 1985 event. Advertisements were posted in city buildings and invitations sent out. Attendance was considered poor.
Safety belt and car seat information were made a part of the curricula for first aid and safety classes at the Provo City Red Cross.	Classes were held throughout 1985 in which about 500 persons were instructed on safety belts.
Incorporation of safety belt information in an ongoing health risk assessment program entitled "Alive & Well."	About 1,000 persons attended these workshops during 1985/86.
Presentations regarding the occupant protection program made to Senator Hatch's Provo staff and a local senior citizen center.	August presentations. Thirty senior citizens were reminded of the importance of using safety belts and provided with literature.
<u>DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS</u>	
The logo "Buckle Up Utah County" was used to promote the program. The program also used a mascot (BUUC the Cowboy) to spread its message.	BUUC the Cowboy appeared at a variety of promotional activities including fairs, parades, and school events.

UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

Participated in the annual "Family City, USA" fair in Orem. Displayed safety restraint information and distributed literature.

The July 1985 and July 1986 4-day events both resulted in exposure to over 2,500 residents.

Participated in the Provo City Freedom Festival. Set up a display and gave away candy, balloons, brochures, and other educational materials. Sponsored an entry in the July 4th Freedom Festival Parade.

At least 750 balloons were given away and more than 1,500 people received safety restraint literature during the 4-day event in July 1986. The parade was viewed by over 50,000 residents and visitors and was televised statewide.

A buckle up display placed in a local shopping mall during a back-to-school safety event entitled "Safety City."

Over 1,000 pieces of literature and other educational materials were given out during one week in August.

Set up a display at the Utah County Fair. Gave out literature, pencils, balloons, stickers, and decals. Gave away T-shirts and consumer health books in a drawing for persons who signed pledge cards.

An August 1986 4-day event. About 25,000 people attended the fair and about 2,500 pieces of literature were distributed.

Participated in a "Kid's Health Fair" sponsored by a local hospital. Gave away balloons and other educational items to children and parents.

Over 900 children accompanied by their parents attended the August 1986 event.

Safety belt messages displayed on large digital display signs used by local merchants for advertising.

Four merchants displayed a safety belt message on a regular basis during the summer months.

BUSINESSES

A Corporate Safety belt Conference held for chief executive officers in Provo. Attendees were given safety belt materials and the manual "Corporate Safety Belt Programs." They also signed pledge cards, with prizes awarded.

The luncheon was held in October 1985. Over 20 CEOs and/or personnel directors attended. Several companies established and promoted safety belt policies as a result of the conference.

UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
<u>BUSINESSES</u>	
The project displayed safety belt information at an Employee Benefit Fair.	Over 500 persons attended the October 1985 fair sponsored by a local hospital.
Made presentations, gave advice, and provided informational materials to businesses to initiate policies.	Employers established policies or initiated programs that impacted thousands of employees.
<u>SCHOOL ACTIVITIES</u>	
An elementary school Safety Fair that included materials, the convincer, and speakers.	Over 650 students attended the November 1984 fair.
"Save Your Family" kits given to children to take home to their families (pledge cards, stickers, information, incentive coupons, and other items). Pledge cards were returned for candy prizes. Children also saw a video, rode the convincer, and were visited by BUUC and a robot brought by an officer of the Utah Highway Patrol.	About 4500 "Save Your Family" kits were sent home with elementary school children (one from each family) during April 1985. Over 2500 pledge cards were returned.
A coloring contest for elementary and mentally handicapped students.	All Provo elementary children (nearly 8,000) saw a safety belt video. About 3,500 rode the convincer. Over 7,000 saw BUUC and "Trooper Tron."
Copies of the curriculum guide "A Safer Way For Every Day" plus additional materials given to school librarians.	Over 5,000 entries during the November 1985 event.
Film-based presentations given to an elementary school after they were requested. Also certificates with attached fact sheets given out; signed certificates returned to local fast food restaurant for free fries.	Copies given to each Provo elementary school librarian for teachers to check out.
	Two presentations were delivered in an elementary school with over 550 students during November 1985

UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Incentive program for high school students that included wall displays, films, the convincer, and educational items such as stickers, pencils, and litter bags. Signed pledge cards were entered in drawings for prizes; food coupons given to students wearing safety belts

Two high schools with about 1,400 students each held campaigns during March/April 1986. Over 800 pledge cards were signed at the two schools.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS

An Occupant Protection Conference held to announce the program and solicit community support. Included displays, demonstrations, and presentations on (1) what a community can do to promote occupant protection; (2) the role of occupant restraints in preventing injury/death; (3) safety restraint education in the schools and businesses.

This was the program's kickoff event held in October 1984. Over 35 people attended representing the medical community, law enforcement, schools, civic groups, and businesses.

A week of activities in Salem City that included coupons awarded for safety belt use, distribution of informational materials, classroom presentations at Salem elementary, and a Safety Fair.

About 700 people received occupant protection information during the March 1985 event.

A radio/incentive program that awarded prizes to residents wearing safety belts and made them eligible to win grand prizes.

The September 1986 campaign wrap-up event. Over 400 bags of prizes were given away and grand prizes were awarded on the air. More than \$5,000 of prizes and goods were donated.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

<u>Activity/Agent</u>	<u>Intensity/Exposure</u>
Activities conducted for All American Buckle Up week. In 1985: news report on local TV, stickers placed in Provo businesses, posters in public buildings, and pledge cards at public facilities. In 1986: paycheck stuffers for County employees; reminder cards and stickers given out at immunization clinics.	About 150 buckle up stickers placed in Provo businesses in November 1985. Also, over 100 people signed pledge cards. Tellers at five banks reminded customers to buckle up. In November 1986, 475 persons received paycheck stuffers. Over 500 parents at clinics received cards; about 100 children a day got stickers.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	8/84	*6/85+9/85	*7/86	*12/86
Restraint Use	15%	18%	24%	27%

*Changes in methodology; i.e. types of sites and occupants recorded.

<u>TELEPHONE SURVEY</u>	1984	12/86
Respondent's Use of Safety Belts		
Always	16%	26%
Most of Time	24%	36%
Sometimes	38%	31%
Never	22%	7%
Exposed to Safety Belt Information		
During:	Last Two weeks	Last Few Months
Very Frequently	7%	Yes 80.3%
Frequently	11%	No 19.7%
Occasionally	27%	
None	55%	
Source of Information		
Radio	19%	27%
TV	36%	62%
Newspaper	27%	33%
Work	5%	7%
Public School	4%	Community 11%
Other	9%	18%

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Observational and survey data showed an increase in safety belt use since the onset of the program. According to project staff, the most effective program activities included "Save Your Family" kits targeting elementary age students, corporate and high school safety belt education/incentive programs, the development and distribution of a church curriculum promoting safety belt use, and a variety of media campaigns targeting the general population.

UTAH COUNTY, UTAH

GENERAL ASSESSMENT (continued)

The program failed to attain the level of belt use projected in its objectives. Several major impediments during the course of the program were noted:

- (1) The project was planned for Utah County, which meant having to work with more than 20 different municipalities. This proved too large a task and led to an agreement to concentrate on Provo with a filter effect to other county communities.
- (2) The first program coordinator was new to the community, and therefore unfamiliar with its members, resources, subtleties, and peculiarities.
- (3) Federal and state contacts changed several times and the local coordinator left the program midway through the project. This resulted in some confusion and misunderstanding of expectations.

EXHIBIT B-12: SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Population: 64,138 (1980)

Program Period: 1/84 - 3/86

State SBUL: Enacted 3/86; Effective 6/86; Fine Effective 1/87
Child Restraint Law 1984

Fine: \$25-\$45 (SUBL) Enforcement: Secondary

Program Dimensions: Program elements addressed the educational, medical, media, and major business networks.

MEDIA

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

RADIO

PSAs aired by a local radio station.

There were 476 PSAs in 1985: 28 for a February Valentine program for children, 28 for "Traffic Safety Awareness Week" in March, and 420 for the November "All Skagit Buckle Up" campaign.

NEWSPAPERS

Local press coverage of the November 1985 "All Skagit Buckle Up" campaign.

Fourteen news articles.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

EDUCATORS: Cooperation of school officials and personnel with numerous activities.

See school activities section below.

PUBLIC OFFICIALS: Involvement of municipal officials in the "All Skagit Buckle Up" campaign.

Municipal leaders cosponsored the program, were involved in planning, gave support, and were involved in activities.

POLICE: Participated in the "All Skagit Buckle Up" campaign. Follow up adoption by one police force of wearing the state logo lapel pin on their uniforms.

Police stopped drivers and rewarded safety restraint users with coupons and gave nonusers litter bags filled with safety belt-related items and literature.

SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

COMMUNITY SUPPORT (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE WITH ACTIVITIES

MEDIA: PSA's during several special campaigns and events.

See media above.

MEDICAL COMMUNITY: Letters were mailed to local doctors and dentists asking their support by displaying "Protect Your Dreams" posters in their offices.

A total of 176 letters were mailed in June 1985. There were 113 positive responses.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS

News releases.

There were 16 news releases in 1984 and 27 in 1985.

PRESENTATIONS

Speaking engagements and public presentations.

In 1984, ten public speaking engagements to adult organizations and one elementary class presentation. In 1985, 42 public presentations including 30 elementary schools, 7 employers, 4 high schools, and 1 expectant parents group. Three evaluation presentations at both Washington and Idaho State Conferences.

Speaker's bureau formed.

Formed under the umbrella of the County DWI program.

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

Display booth participation.

In 1984: at the 2 major shopping malls during "Traffic Safety Week" (March), the May Homeshow, July Mt. Vernon Street Fair, August County Fair, and September Skagit Valley Hospital Health Fair. In 1985, the August County Fair and September Skagit Valley Hospital and Birthing Center Open House. In 1986, at shopping malls during the March "National Baby Week" and at the May "Health Fair" hosted by a local hospital.

SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

DISPLAYS/DEMONSTRATIONS

Wallboard displays on safety belts.

Two set up in the County Administration Building.

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

"It's a Matter of Time" multi-media film/lecture presentation sponsored by the Washington State Patrol.

Hosted by each of the six County high schools in April 1984.

Workshops for Driver's Education instructors on how they could correct misinformation and modify negative attitudes about safety restraints.

Three workshops conducted in the 1984-1985 school year. Led to three high schools using portions of "It's a Matter of Time" support packages in their classrooms.

Workshop training for teachers on the "Real Connection" and "Here's Looking at You, Two" programs.

Eighty teachers received a three-day workshop in May 1984. Three elementary schools used the prepackaged materials during the 1984-85 school year.

Valentine program for elementary school and pre-elementary school children. Participants received valentines, stickers, and other materials with buckle up messages.

About 1450 children participated in February 1985 and more than 2800 children participated in February 1986.

"September Safety" program for elementary school students. Filmstrips and other structured information were provided to K-2 students. Grades 3-6 received pencils, litter bags, book covers, etc.

Approximately 1,000 elementary students in one school district were involved in September 1985.

Poster contests for elementary school children.

One in May 1984 and one in December 1984.

County-wide essay contest for students in 7th through 12th grades. Contestants addressed the issue of safety belts (convince their peers or parents of the importance of wearing them or give their opinion on a safety belt law for teenagers).

Eighty-seven participants in the May 1985 contest. A second essay contest is being conducted in May 1986 (post-study period).

SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (continued)

Activity/Agent

Intensity/Exposure

BUSINESSES

Questionnaires were sent to all area physicians and dentists seeking their attitudes about safety restraints as a health issue.

Sent out in May 1984. Twenty persons subsequently were identified as interested in a task force effort. Also 45 requests for brochures to distribute in private offices and 34 requests for information on the County car seat loan program. All requests were fulfilled.

Survey of preschools/licensed day care homes concerning their interest and support of safety belt use.

Forty-two were surveyed in May 1985. In response, four requested simple group presentations and 21 requested informational materials.

Presentations to employers, building support for employer safety programs.

Five employers adopted safety belt policies for their employees during 1984.

SPECIAL CAMPAIGNS/EVENTS

Traffic Safety Awareness Week.

Proclaimed it March 1985. It included media publicity and a recognition ceremony for high school youth who had been involved in traffic safety programs.

"All Skagit Buckle Up" campaign that included a kickoff proclamation signed by municipal leaders, elementary school presentations in two districts, a County-wide poster contest for school-age youths, and a coupon give-away.

Approximately 66,000 people were affected by the November 1985 campaign. The program resulted in 6 cities adopting safety restraint policies for their employees and County adoption of a more comprehensive revision.

EVALUATION MEASURES

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	12/83	*9/84	*7-8/85	*3/86
Restraint Use:				
Age 12 and Younger	27%	59%	58%	63%
Adult (20+)	13%	18%	23%	25%
All Age Groups	14.3%	21%	26.7%	27.7%

*Change in sites, observation times, and observation days from baseline survey.

SKAGIT COUNTY, WASHINGTON

EVALUATION MEASURES (continued)

<u>OBSERVATION DATA</u>	12/83	3/86
<u>Restraint Use:</u>		
Drivers	13%	25%
Male	11.45%	22%
Female	15.1%	29.6%
Passengers	22.2%	36%

WASHINGTON STATE PATROL RECORDS

In 1983, there were 19 reported fatalities and 677 disabling injuries in Skagit County. In 1985, there were 14 fatalities and 159 disabling injuries in Skagit County.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Baseline survey data suggested a need for safety restraint education among all age groups. Infants/toddlers were targeted through increased car seat loan programs and inventories; school-age youths were targeted through multiple school activities; and adults were approached through speaking engagements, employer programs, and the "All Skagit Buckle Up" campaign.

The 13.4% increase in safety restraint use was attributed to many factors: community education, passage of a child restraint law, prior program efforts, incentive programs, and employer policy statements.